

MAX MILAM: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1974-1978

Interviewee: Max Milam

Interviewed: 1977

Published: 1998

Interviewer: Mary Ellen Glass

UNOHP Catalog #091

Description

Dr. Max Milam served as president of the University of Nevada, Reno, from 1974 to 1978. He gave his talents as a business and political manager to the university during those years, and made important changes in the institution's methods of operation. Inevitably, perhaps, Dr. Milam's approaches became controversial with some people, and many of his plans remained unrealized.

Dr. Max Milam's reminiscence is the third of this series of Presidential Memoirs, following those of N. Edd Miller and James T. Anderson.

**MAX MILAM: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR,
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1974-1978**

MAX MILAM: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1974-1978

WE GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGE THE ASSISTANCE OF
SHELBA GAMBLE IN PREPARATION OF THIS MEMOIR.

An Oral History Conducted by Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1998
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1998.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: R.T. King

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Background, Organization	1
Background	
Early Impressions and Plans	
Inauguration	
Organization of Office	
Thoughts on Administration	
2. Faculty Relations	23
Leaders, Governance	
3. Campus Administrators	37
4. Relationship with the Chancellor's Office	57
5. Board of Regents	67
6. Nevada Legislature Activity	77
7. Problems and Crises	87

8. Public Relations and Press Relations	95
9. Conclusion: June, 1977	107
Original Index: For Reference Only	109

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Max Milam served as President of the University of Nevada-Reno from 1974-1978. He gave his talents as a business and political manager to the University during those years, and made important changes in the institution's methods of operation. Inevitably, perhaps, Dr. Milam's approaches became controversial with some people, and many of his plans remained unrealized.

When invited to record a *Presidential Memoir*, Dr. Milam accepted readily and graciously. He was a generous and candid chronicler of the early years of his Presidency through nine taping sessions, all held in his office between February 11, 1977 and June 1, 1977. Probably judiciously, Dr. Milam declined to record the circumstances of his departure from the University, although historians in the future will be poorer for lacking this information. Dr. Milam's review of the transcript resulted in no changes in language, and only a few minor corrections.

The Oral History Project of the University of Nevada-Reno Library preserves the past and present for future research by tape

recording the recollections of people who have been important to the development of the region. Dr. Max Milam's reminiscence is the third of this series of *Presidential Memoirs*, following those of N. Edd Miller and James T. Anderson. Dr. Milam has generously donated his literary rights in the volume to the University of Nevada, restricting research access until 1998. Copies of Dr. Milam's Memoir are deposited with the Oral History Project and the University Archives, restricted as designated above.

Mary Ellen Glass
University of Nevada-Reno
1981

BACKGROUND, ORGANIZATION

BACKGROUND

I was born on a little forty-acre hill farm in Arkansas about forty-six and a half years ago. I think my interest in education was not come by entirely just by accident. The reason my parents moved from there essentially was to get the kids into a better school than they were, and I think that very intentional move on their part kind of reflects the kind of teaching that all of our kids got. I have a brother who's a schoolteacher and I have a sister who's probably frustrated because she's not a schoolteacher. So, we were all involved in education. I've been involved in other things along the way, but, you know, that's our *thing*. Basically, I think it comes from our parents.

I spent the first six years of my life on that farm and moved to a little town of Charleston ('bout 250 people), and Fort Smith when I was nine. And I grew up there, finished high school, did not plan to go to college at that time. Then [we] got married and had our first child. [I] went to work for a printing company running a printing press, and stayed there

for—well, we stayed there until '51. I decided I'd like to go to college and so, Marilyn and I (my wife and I)—. She's a wonderful wife, by the way. She's. always been willing to do anything that I wanted to try to do. But we decided to go to school.

We took a trip trying to find a university fairly close to Fort Smith where I could work and go to school. There was no way that I could go to school unless I could find a job. And we wound up at a little school in Shawnee, Oklahoma called Oklahoma Baptist University, and that's not too unusual; I am a Baptist, I was, and I grew up in a Baptist church.

We moved there in September of ['51] and I did my baccalaureate work. I had an enjoyable time. The faculty there was quite good during the years that I was there. Later on it deteriorated somewhat, but I had a number of very good teachers while I was there, especially in political science and philosophy which turned out to be my—well, political science, philosophy, and history, almost a triple major. Those are the fields I really focused on.

Did a master's degree (course work for a master's degree) the following—after I finished, after I graduated— the year after I did the course work for a master's degree, University of Oklahoma. I had done an honors program at OBU. The University of Oklahoma administered the exams for the honors program. Before I finished the degree, though, I took a job managing the printing plant in Shawnee where I had been working while I was going to school and that kind of interrupted the master's program. That really interrupted my education, too. I didn't finish my thesis, then, until about the time I decided to leave printing and go back to do my Ph.D. I had left the plant in Oklahoma and taken a job with a large printing company in New York which transferred me very quickly to the West Coast, where I stayed for two years before deciding, I'm gonna go back and do my Ph.D. Went back to Oklahoma to do that Ph.D. I taught full time at Central State College, now Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma, finished my degree, left Central State, moved to the University of Kentucky, was there five years, then moved to the University of Arkansas where I was sort of going back home. Actually, it was not a going-back-home type of move; we decided, sort of, to leave the year before and I stayed on one more year so that my oldest daughter could finish high school in Lexington. And the University of Arkansas really'd been the most interesting job that was available that year that we sort of decided to move.

[I] took the chairmanship at Arkansas and, almost as soon as I returned to Arkansas, I got involved with—. Well, within six months, Win Rockefeller was running for governor, when I moved back. And as soon as he was elected, a friend of mine at Arkansas got me involved in consulting work with him. So during the three years after I moved back, I was building,

I think, fairly successfully, a political science program. We went from, oh, three or four professors the year I came, to about twelve in three years' time and enrollments increased correspondingly. We really built—well, they had one master's student when I went there, and we had about thirty, I think, when I left.

We developed a Master of Public Administration program while I was there. I got considerable outside funding for it. But during that time also, I began doing some consulting work for Governor Rockefeller, and working on prisons— organization and management of prisons; the organization and management of public health programs; some work with the private sector in the health service system. [I] chaired a couple of conferences (statewide conferences) for him on the delivery of health services. [I] did a study on the reorganization of state government and came out with a proposal to reorganize Arkansas state government, which, by the way later on, I got to help adopt.

Anyway, in '69, after I did all of that, Win was having some difficulty with some of his top management and he asked if I would come down and take over either the department of administration or the department of planning. And the administration appealed to me most—that was my academic field, is why. It was a way to go out and practice what I was teaching, which I thought would—. I took that assignment mainly because I thought of what it would do for my professional growth, at least that's what I felt.

Anyway, I stayed on with Win until he was defeated in '70, and made arrangements—I was on a two-year leave of absence from the university and made arrangements to go back to the university—but the governor-elect, Dale Bumpers, decided otherwise. At least he decided I should stay on, and I did stay on the rest of that year and then when he very

persuasively suggested that I should stay on longer, I resigned from the university. I didn't have to, but I thought it was better to. I feel strongly, a person should never remain on leave of absence from a university for a very long time. Two years is about the limit, I think.

Anyway, within a very few months, Win Rockefeller approached me asking me if I would consider going back to work for him—I'm not even sure he had a job in mind, at that time, but anyway, the upshot of it all was that I did arrange to go back and undertake kind of a reorganization of Win's own activities. We set up an associates group with people heading up all his real estate activities, his farming activities, and so on. And I was supposed to try to coordinate all those activities, including his philanthropic activities, for the first time ever; they'd never been coordinated before, 'cause Win certainly never did it. And serve him as his chief financial officer. He died within a year, just over a year, and I stayed on; he named me as executor of his estate in his will shortly after I went to work for him. And the first several months after his death were very busy times.

But after that the work kind of tailed off as far as I was concerned, and I began thinking what I was going to spend the rest of my life doing. And obviously, I really wanted to go back into higher education. I did look into a couple of industry jobs, but a friend of mine, a man named Marion Burton who is a colleague, heard somewhere (I'm not sure exactly where) that the University of Nevada at Reno was looking for a president. And, anyway, he asked if I would like to be recommended for it, and I said, "Sure. Why not?"

Because I had considered—I guess, the *best* alternative that I had, that I'd thought about, was going back into higher education. I really was not thinking so much about a

presidency. Well, I guess I *had* begun to think about a presidency at that time. I was being considered—I was one of the ones on the list for the University of Arkansas presidency, as a matter of fact. I think I would not have received that job, although I took the UNR's offer before they settled the one at Arkansas.

Anyhow, it was a rather candid assessment of the fact that I'd made some people angry at the university when I was director of administration for the state. There's always a very intense conflict between state budget officers and universities, and it's true in every state that I've been in. And while I was in the state budget office, I guess I functioned more like a budget officer than I did like a university professor, and I made some people angry about that.

Anyway, I was first written by Don Driggs to see if I was in fact interested. We sent a resume out. I didn't spend much time thinking about it. You know, it was kind of a remote possibility, as a matter of fact. I heard nothing for a long time after that and I think I was told first that I did not make the final slate of candidates, as I recall. Then I had a phone call shortly after that from Don Driggs asking if I were still interested. And I said, "Yes." And then Tom O'Brien came to Arkansas—Little Rock—to talk. I think Tom had a son that was working for the Camelot Inn there at the time. I do remember that Tom arrived and it was a very hectic day. It seemed that everything was coming unglued. And we spent some two or three hours talking, but I don't even recall what we talked about. I had a thousand other things on my mind that day. It was kind of one of those unfortunate interruptions on a very busy day, you know. I think he talked to some other folks, and of course I—most of the people I knew well in academic life were at Fayetteville. And at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, I was teaching a class

just on a gratuity basis that spring when it looked like my workload was winding down I was asked—I'd *been* asked for several years if I would come out and teach. And since my workload was kind of winding down I said that I would, but then the workload sort of picked up.

Anyway, I think that Tom did go out and talk to people of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. I don't know that for a fact. And I was invited then out here for interview in, I believe, March of '74. (You'd have those dates better than I would.)

We had a very busy interview schedule. I think University of Nevada, Reno, probably keeps their prospects busier during interviews than any place I've ever seen. And I've continued that myself. I didn't mind it terribly when I was here, but it was a very busy time. I was here, I think, two days, and I was jumping *all* the time and there was something scheduled every minute, it seemed like. (I do recall that you and I spent some time driving around and I got a very good tour. In fact, I've *used* you a few times to provide tours for people coming in. I believe you took [Mrs. John] Nellor around, didn't you? Very good tour.)

And I returned—I'm trying to reconstruct. I'm not sure whether I was eliminated—I think I was *not* then eliminated after the interview. I don't know how many were interviewed, but as I recall, I think that the next word that I received from Reno was that I had been chosen as one of the finalists. Anyway I was asked (Marilyn and I were asked) out to meet the Regents. The first time I was here I met the Chancellor, but no one else, really. And the second time that we came, Marilyn and I *both* came out; we met the Regents and did not get on the campus at all, the second trip.

That was a *strange* interview. In fact, I was upset. I was told beforehand that there were

three candidates, I believe, and they'd have all three of them here at the same time, and that we'd all eat and have a dinner together with the Regents in the evening. I never heard of an interview taking place like that. After being here I can understand the way it was spread out and the difficulty Regents have moving from one part of the state to another. I can see why it made sense to do it that way, but it was something that I had not experienced before.

Anyway, we came out. We really felt the interview had not gone very well. My wife got in an argument with one of the Regents over horses (she's a great horse fancier) and various diseases they're subject to and so on. And we pretty well decided that, you know, we really didn't consider the University much flying back. I don't know why. By the time we returned to Arkansas, we had a call from Chancellor Humphrey offering us the post. They had made a very quick decision and they wanted to make the announcement immediately. I asked them to hold off until, I think, Monday or Tuesday of the following—well, it was Saturday, and I wanted to wait. I had a few associates that I felt I needed to inform before it was put in the press. And I would have got by with it except that I forgot about the time difference. (Well, that wouldn't be it because it would have been announced later out here than back there—.) Anyway, the announcement was made before our arrangements could be made. Anyway, that didn't work out.

And we had some difficulty over the time that I could come. There was no way that I could get away by July the first which was when they wanted me here, and we finally compromised. I wanted to come September the first and finally compromised on August the first. And that simply was to, you know, to give me time to wind up; two months is a very short time to wind up affairs and move.

Even at a university it'd be very, very hard; even in the kind of work that I was in where I just [was] executor of the estate and office manager. I still was manager of the estate, too, playing about the same role that I'd played when Win was alive. Even that was awfully hard to break off in that short period of time.

In motives in accepting the job, you've asked about that. It goes back, I think, to I identify very strongly with the field of higher education. I wanted to go back into it, certainly; had always thought that I would. The main reason why I'd taken the job with Win was that he had a program in rural development which I am extremely interested in, and he was planning a ten-year, sort of a demonstration project in Arkansas in what could be done in rural development. In fact, the national Rural Development Act of '73, was passed largely thanks to his efforts. He spent a lot of money lobbying it through Congress, getting it adopted.

Most of the work that I had done in Arkansas had a strong rural development flavor, even the health service work, for example. One of our big concerns was how do we get health services in rural areas.

EARLY IMPRESSIONS AND PLANS

I never have worked in anything other than the land grant institutions since I taught at Central State College. I taught there so I could go to school at OU. I like land grant schools. I like the statewide contacts which are built into the land grant program. It's not just the agricultural part of the program. I think one of the things I've stressed here is trying to expand the outreach program which is housed in the College of Agriculture to other types of concerns and activities. I haven't gotten very far with it, but we're making little bits of progress and I think the people

who are involved, Dean Bohmont and Dick Dankworth now, understand the direction I want to move.

There's still a lot of difficulty in getting it worked out so we can move that way. And it goes back to oh, concerns of—. Oh, Dean Bohmont is a dean of the College of Agriculture, and has a kind of a exclusivist approach about *his* programs, and obviously the type of thing I'd like to see done involves much more than—it would involve cooperating with other programs on campus. And anytime you cooperate with somebody you lose some of your autonomy, you know. But I think we're moving that way. It's certainly a way that I'd like to move.

It is more difficult in a state like Nevada where you have a rather sparse rural population, widely scattered, than it would be in a state like Arkansas, for example, to develop that kind of a *total* outreach university program. As a matter of fact, I think the University had been cutting back on its other services in the rest of Nevada the two years before I came here.

On the early assessment of Reno problems, I guess my first impression of the University is one I never have changed (been modified some along the way) and it's kinda hard to separate *entirely* that initial assessment from what it's later become. If I'd abandoned that earlier assessment totally, I could go back and say, "Well, this is what I *thought*, and this is what I *think*, now." But it hasn't worked that way. I think the early assessment was pretty accurate, and I think I understand at least in part some of the reasons behind what I saw. I felt like the University was kind of turned inward, if I could put it that way. Organizations under stress react usually one of two ways, in terms of just reaction as opposed to any kind of a rational program. They either turn inward or else they start striking out blindly and

irrationally against whatever they happen to think is bothering them.

I think the University of Nevada-Reno had turned inward very, very badly. That maybe is not a very good expression; it's not a very *descriptive* expression, but I think I can explain what I mean. A case in point: We had a very good evening program at one point in time, and when it appeared that the evening program was interfering with our state funding, because those students were not counted in the FTE base (upon which we were funded), instead of tryin' to figure out some way to keep the evening program and do something else, the response was simply to cut off the evening program. And it was cut out, totally. That was a terrible mistake. We're having a very hard time, still, getting that evening program built back up and I've—we've pressed every way that you can press, I think, short of just sending out orders that, you know, each department must offer a certain number of courses in the evening. We haven't done that.

We've leaned very hard trying to get evening courses offered, and I think there is a demand for it. But that's the type of thing that I see as a kind of turning inward, you know. If our evening programs are hurting us, then we'll just cut off the evening program. Turning inward because the evening program itself is kind of an outreach program. That's a time when people out in the community come on the campus and take classes, and we're sort of cutting ourselves off from the community.

You know, I was fortunate, I think, in coming here, in the sense that I had two written documents that—. It was a centennial year; the centennial year began shortly after I arrived anyway, and Jim Hulse was just publishing (it was just coming out at the time I got here, or shortly after I arrived) the centennial history of the [University]. It's a

very well done book, and for a new president coming in to have that type of information, that he can go back and read the history of the University and be able to get in one evening what would take, you know, months and months of conversations to pick up even a part of that.

The other thing I had was the McHenry Report that was what, seventeen years, sixteen years old at that time? But still I think much of the problems the McHenry Report talked about were still—if they were not problems, at least the memory of those problems was still very strong in the University. And I think both of those were quite valuable documents for a new president coming in to have access to. If the University gets another one, they ought to make those required reading for him, you know, before he ever starts doing anything, *read these!* [Laughs]

Anyway, I felt like the University had to be turned around somewhat. It had to try to rebuild some linkages with the community. It needed to do a better job of relating its mission to the overall concerns of the community. And I in no way mean that the University has to become subordinate to the community. If that happens, then the University loses its reason for *being*. I had an occasion to go back. I don't recall what the occasion was. Anyway, I did go back and reread one of the early speeches, the first speech I made to the faculty; the NSP wanted me to meet with their group and I declined, but said that I would be happy to meet in a more general meeting with faculty. And so I made a speech to the faculty in early September or in September of the first year I was here. Went back and read it about a month ago and I still agree with it. I don't think that's just being blind on my part. I think that it indicates that the early assessment was a pretty accurate one. And I wondered, if maybe I shouldn't dust it off and use it again. I think there's still room for it.

INAUGURATION

Oh, plans for, and assessment of the inauguration—and you know I have a very difficult time even reconstructing that period. I arrived in August and I was still working like seventy, eighty hours a week right here in the office trying to get on top of the—trying to understand the University, and so on.

It's something that sort of happened to me rather than something I was involved in. Of course, it was tied in with the Centennial celebration. Sam Basta was the person in charge of the Centennial celebration and he inherited the inauguration, along with that event, with the Centennial generally.

Oh, a couple of things stand out in my mind about it. I was asked about a speaker and I prevailed upon Alex Heard who is Chancellor of Vanderbilt, a good friend, to come out and make the inaugural address on my behalf. I chose not to make any kind of speech myself other than just a brief acknowledgment.

I guess the high point of the inauguration from my standpoint was the—we sent out, of course (I say *we* did; Sam's office sent out), the typical invitations to all the universities and one day Sam popped in the office and said, "Hey, we got a president coming!" And presidents hardly ever—you know, years ago this was kinda standard that presidents would try to attend this sort of thing, but we have so many colleges and universities now, and they change presidents so often that it would be a terribly onerous task to try to attend them personally, and it just dropped out of the picture. What happens, of course, is that when they come in here we turn to the alumni association and try to find someone that lives in the community. Quite frequently when they send us the invitation they'll send a note along saying, "So-and-so, on our faculty, or in

our community is a member of—a graduate of your institution and would be happy to represent you." And that's what we usually do.

Anyway, I said, "Oh, who?"

He said, "Somebody from Wake Forest." And of course, that somebody was James Ralph Scales, who is a very old and very dear (he's not that *old*), but a very, very dear friend. He's been a good friend for a long, long time. And when he got the invitation, he just responded and said, "Yes, I'll be there."

And so, since he was coming, we asked him to undertake the role of bringing greetings from other universities and learned societies and frankly, I think, he stole the show. He's a terribly witty man, knows me perhaps *too* well, and was able to read into his comments some personal information that made the occasion much more meaningful to me. Alex, of course, did prepare a major type address; and it attracted some attention, but not as much as it should have, given the type of address he prepared, and he had done it just for this occasion.

James Ralph [in] his comment—in fact he left me—someone asked me for a copy of his speech and so he left it with me and in the same handwriting as always, which is virtually illegible. [Laughs] And we tried to decipher it and then sent it back to him for editing and (I guess we didn't publish it) we had it available for people that asked for it. It was a very entertaining speech. And that was the thing that sticks in my mind, I guess, is the whole thing was the contributions of those two people and James Ralph in particular. We did pay only Alex's expenses, no honoraria of any sort. We did pay Alex's expenses, but we paid nothing for James Ralph. I think I'm right on that. In any event, expenses were not a part of his decision to come out.

It was a very pleasant occasion, a very nice occasion, but that's about the extent of

my recollection of it. And I feel sort of guilty, you know, I don't remember any better than that, but really I was sort of the—part of the raw material involved in the process, more than being in command of the process.

Mary Ellen Glass: I'm sure you are right about everybody remembering more about Scales's talk than Heard's.

Yeah, he's a terribly delightful fellow. We are in constant communication still (when I say *constant*, neither one of us are what you'd call big letter writers), but, we use the telephone a great deal, and hardly a month goes by but he calls me about something or I call him about something that we find of mutual concern. He has a private university. He's done an excellent job at Wake Forest. He has improved the reputation of the school, I think, considerably in the time he's been there. It's about ten years now, he's been there. And by the way, he was executive vice president at Oklahoma Baptist University when I was going to school there, where our association began, when I was an undergraduate. His field is history and political science.

In fact, another friend from OBU days, a man named Corbitt Rushing, is now at North Carolina Wesleyan (I believe that's the name of the school, in Rocky Mount, North Carolina), and about a week ago, I got in the mail carbon copies of letters that had been written back and forth at the time that I was doing my honors program in my senior year in college. And the University of Oklahoma administered those exams; and these were letters by Scales, setting up the exams and this sort of thing. And Corbitt apparently, in cleaning out his files, came across this mass of stuff and dumped it off on me. It's kinda interesting to go back and read.

ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE

Organization of the office—are you ready to move on to that? That's a toughie.

Well, it is, but it's one of the more interesting things in finding out what makes a university tick. You know, how does the president's office get organized? Who works there? How does the president see his staff? How does he make his assignments? How does he choose personnel?]

Any great disappointment that I've had here is my own office, and, I guess you know, maybe it's vain or vanity or just candid assessment—I think of myself as a manager, but not a supervisor. I'm a lousy supervisor. And I take that to being assignment of—as opposed to problems, it's assignment of tasks and supervising the completion of those tasks. I gather that before I came here the office had a highly competent secretary, Jean Baldwin. And at the time that the change was occurring, she decided that she'd retire at the same time. I never have forgiven her for that.

On the visit out here in June in '74, I was given a task of interviewing the five finalists—somebody else had selected those, one of those internal-type recruitments, and within the classified service. (And, incidentally, I have yet to come to terms with the states civil service system. It's an abomination, in my estimation. It's one of the bigger crosses the University has to bear, I think. And that's a very candid assessment. I almost think having it unionized would be an improvement, it's so bad. Believe me, I do.)

Anyway, I was—you know, the final recruitment and the terms had already been established before I arrived on the scene; and I had five finalists that I could interview. I think I hired the wrong one of that five after I've known some of the candidates. I think

Mena Porta would have been a much better choice for the job than Clara [Farnsworth]. Clara came highly recommended and she just hasn't worked out. You know, there's no way around it, and it's a situation where she's now only a few months away from retirement; and I really felt boxed in where I really couldn't do anything about a bad situation. If it weren't so serious, you know, it becomes comical.

Lorna [Loshbaugh] never accumulates more than two days of annual leave without taking it. It's a constant problem and she has personal phone—spends a lot of her time on the phone with family problems. And she does, she is, she has some serious health troubles. She's had about three major operations since I've been here. In all the offices I've worked in, I have never worked in one that was as totally unsatisfactory from the office staff standpoint as this one. And I think it's bad from the standpoint of the impression that people in the University and *outside* the University receive of the office.

If I were a better taskmaster, supervisor, et cetera, I could probably have dealt with it much better than I have; but, if I have one big failure, it's that, since I've been here. That's my immediate staff.

I really don't like to sound hypercritical, but it really is hard to find much to say that's complimentary about the office staff, and that's bad. But I really have become kind of bitter about it. You know, there's clear evidence of places where things that should be treated confidentially have been leaked, you know. It's just a range of transgressions—that's not too strong a word, I think—that made it very difficult. Plus I think that the office has simply not presented a good image.

Anecdotes—Clara on the telephone. Telephones still mystify Clara. "Hold" buttons terrify her. One day she had a call—I had a call and I was not at my desk; I was standing

out near her desk and she turned around to tell me that So-and-so was on the telephone. And I said, "I don't want to talk to him right now. I'll call him back later," or something like that, you know. I really wasn't ready to talk to him at that point in time. And Shelba was—this was after Shelba was here [gesture]—and she was—and I realized then when she began doing that, that Clara had not punched the "hold" button and she was holding the phone, talking like this [gestures cross-talk] into the telephone [laughs]—interesting, eh?

I really feel terribly inadequate, but I never have been able to—never in my life have I ever failed so totally in getting people to become members of my team, as I have here. I've got a plaque on my wall at home that I think very highly of, when I left state government, I got a tremendous farewell (in fact I got two farewell parties, maybe even more than that), but I certainly got one when I left, a big one, and I got one when I moved out here. I'd been gone for what, three, four years. You know, they published that I was leaving; they got together and had another party for me when I was leaving the state, you know. I've got, oh, some various mementos, one little plaque in particular that I think was, you know, really sincerely meant by people that, you know, we had an adjustment period to go through and some difficult times, but by the time I left, totally, totally, supported, you know. I just never experienced the failure that I've had here in getting people to join in and become a team working together and trying to get the work done.

The extreme difficulty you have, you know, you explain things three or four times as to how things should be done and it comes back to you done wrong; you go through it again and it comes back done wrong. I recall the day that Don Jessup was sitting here when I was having Clara set up some travel

arrangements for me, and it got so ludicrous that Don almost fell out of his chair laughing, finally, when she walked out of the room. You know, it just—everything is that way. And you know, I live in a pressure cooker. I work under pressure; I work best under pressure.

Clara—well, none of the three girls in the office does a very good job with pressure. Agnes responds by withdrawing. Lorna just works the same old pace [laughs], no change. When Clara—when pressure starts, she goes *all* to pieces and *nothing*, but *nothing* gets done. And you know, it's just a question almost of personality compatibility that— that's the kind of environment that I just engender by the way I am, and I know how I work best, you know. So I kind of create that kind of environment for myself, subconsciously, if nothing else.

I like to have tight deadlines, you know, I kinda like to be juggling eight, ten, twelve problems at one time. You know, if I can't find a solution to one, I can move on to another one and deal which ever one suits me best in that point in time. The office staff is not geared—you know, I hadn't really thought about this until this moment. I guess that I'm used to a—that this maybe is a kind of office that a typical academic institution in the popular imagination should be, where things just sort of happen in a nice leisurely manner. That's not my background and that's not my style. Maybe it should be, but it's not.

In terms of just keeping things going, this staff might be adequate. I am not the kind of person that *ever* will be content just to keep things going. I want to see things *happen*. And that's, you know, undoubtedly, the source of part of my problems. I assume that that was known by the people who chose me when I came here, or I wouldn't have been chosen.

You know, there have been some of the most bizarre incidents have happened here

with the office staff. I can't recall any of them. I put 'em out of my mind. If I let myself think about 'em, you know, I'm not sure what I'd do. I'll try to think of some and incorporate them as we go along.

I had an item to dictate over the phone this morning, and I asked Clara to take dictation over the telephone; and when I got back on the phone with the fellow on the other end, he just—"My God, what have you got out there?" [Laughs] One page [of] dictation, and it took about an hour to get it down. Incidentally, you know, some things she does extremely well—little piddling acknowledgment letters, you know. I just say, "Here, draft this"—comes out nice.

In addition to being new—and the attempt was to find someone—some insider, and I did hire Clara. Another curious anecdote there, by the way, I was torn between Clara and Mena and I had a bit of trouble with Mena in the interview. I had some misgivings about how well we'd get along together—the working relationship. And I finally devised a test. It was sort of tied up with the kind of office I would like to have. A test won't always work out; sometimes tests backfire; this one did, I think. I finally decided, well, you know, between the two of 'em, I think, they look to me about equal, and I talked to Bob Jeffers last week and he was flabbergasted how well Clara scored on the test, you know. I'd never heard that 'til just last week. She was tops, tops of the other candidates, and as an outsider coming in—. By the way, I had a good recommendation from everybody that knew her, Ed Cain and everyone else (and I blame him for that to some extent).

I had my wife call looking for me, and I had her call Ed Cain's office, and to call Jim Anderson's, and make sure she was talking to those two people. And, you know, Marilyn and I've been married a long time; we've

worked together as a team for a long time, so this is something that I trust her judgment on. I had her call up and just ask, “Is Max Milam there?” Then to identify—remember I’d already been hired by the time—these two women were candidates for the job. And then after they’d responded, “No,” from either place, to tell them who she was and see how they reacted.

And she reported back that Mena, you know, her voice and everything just changed completely when she found out it was Marilyn Milam (Mrs. Milam), that Clara went ahead and handled it in just a normal sort of a way, implying to me that that rather pleasant voice would obtain with the people that came into the office in a general way—. I have since found out that Mena handles people that drop in a *helluva* lot better than Clara does. But that was one of the final little tests I worked out to try make up my mind between those two which one I would hire. As I say, tests sometimes don’t work out too well; don’t prove much what you want to prove.

Clara, the thing I noticed first about Clara was that, you know, she was new to this office and I understood that; she’d been here about a month when I arrived, working a little bit with Jean, more on her own. She moved about July 1; actually, I arrived in town on the twenty-seventh and I went to work about that time, I think, although I didn’t officially start ’til the first. As soon as I got here, I came to the office and took over the office, although I wasn’t officially president.

The newness of the office, I expected. I made too big an allowance for that. It turned out over time that despite a long-term association with the University, she has simply very little knowledge of University procedures, the types of things you would expect someone to pick up over time. And out-of-state travel regulations are a mystery,

you know; just things that any secretary working in *any* administrative unit on campus you’d think should pick up. Beyond that and you know, this did not become apparent at the time, you know, *in* time though, but her recollection was not good. Every day was a new day, sort of. You’d hash out a problem that involved some procedure and get the procedure straightened out. The next day [laughs] she had to go through it again, and it’s been that way ever since. This morning, you know, I had to have a tenure report ready for the Board of Regents and we had three columns on the page. Clara typed it yesterday. I saw it when I got back from the Chancellor’s office about five-thirty last night and the columns didn’t even line up. You know, a page of columns and they zigzag back and forth. So I told Shelba, I said, “Get it retyped. I will not send out anything that sloppy.” I all too often *do* let it go, and I—where it involves the visual—I’m an old printer—and where it involves the visual appearance of the printed word on the page, I take probably stronger exception to that than most people would. But to come out of a president’s office representing an institution to have columns that don’t line up, you know, this annoys me; it did. And so our first little crisis this morning when Clara had to retype for the *third* time—the first time she had to retype it, Shelba had asked her (Shelba had prepared the work for her to do; I did not do it, Shelba prepared it for the typist)—and asked her to leave a line for the totals, and she’d jammed it together and I said, “Yes, I want the totals.” So they had to go back and retype it and leave space for them.

Clara said, “Oh yes, you told me that; I just didn’t remember.” Each day is a, you know— [laughs].

The other problem was, you know, that Clara would rather please everybody else on campus but me—you know, no real concern

about pleasing *me*, not as far as I could detect. And it's been that way from the very outset. By *pleasing*, I mean trying to understand my modus operandi and adapting to *that*. And that applies to all three of the girls in the office. There's no doubt that I've learned I'm a much different type of person than Edd Miller was, you know, and Jim Anderson too. People around me feel greater pressure. *I* feel greater pressure, I think probably, than some people do, but in part that's self-generated; I know that I work better under pressure, so it's kind of a little device that I play with myself that I—. Anyway, it does create a—. You know, a university might be imagined from the outside as a (university president's office on the outside) a nice relaxed, easygoing activity. It may be in some places, but it's not here. But, you know, nor was any office I ever worked in been that way.

I don't fuss at people, you know. I never give orders and I guess that's part of the problem. If I were the type to say, "Do this," "do that," "do the other," then maybe I wouldn't have had the trouble I've had with the office staff, here. I'm not; you know, it seems to me that if everything you have to do is an order, then what do you do when you *really* want somethin' done, you know? So I seem to think that if I just suggest that it would be nice if this were done that, you know, I mean that as an order. I just think it's a more polite way of doing it. But all too often, I find that suggestions don't get acted on, if they're just suggestions.

Anyway, we juggled work around some, as much as we could. I recall we had Betty Fuss over in the Development office and that was essentially reporting to me at that time, and I had serious concern about Betty. She'd been a candidate for this secretary's job, as a matter of fact. But I just felt like she wasn't doing any work, and then when I had a great big

flap between Clela and Betty and Earl Oliver (Earl is Clela's husband and he works for the legislative research bureau in Carson City. Betty's husband, I think, works for him down in Carson City. I believe that's right), and the troubles they were having here on campus were causing, troubles in Carson City and you know, that's back on us that way.

Anyway, well, Harry Wolf needed a secretary. He didn't have any secretarial help at all and Affirmative Action was becoming really a major problem on campus. So I got Betty to go to work for Harry, as his secretary, but that meant that some of the reports (very simple reports) that Betty'd been doing, you know, they'd need somebody else to do that. Lorna's the one that would always handle the gifts and letters over here. No, I guess Betty did that. Anyway, I was planning to move that function over to this office and Lorna agreed to do the cards and letters, you know, and gifts. That was secretarial work. But the report, that's bookkeeping, and bookkeeping is "not in her job description." And I guess if I had to look back on any one single incident that really indicated the problem I had in the office, that would stand out, you know—totally supported the other two girls, totally supported the other two girls.

The time that Lorna spends on the telephone with personal calls, and you know, you tell her that it's too much and it stops for a while and then it starts back up again—just a general lack of interest in the job is what I would describe the problem here in the office. You know, it's a place to spend the hours from eight to five.

My big problem, by the way, with the secretarial staff was when I decreed that all administrative offices on campus would be open through the lunch hour. I had never worked at a university before that closed down during the lunch hour, and this one

closed down tightly. Every dean's office was locked up from twelve to one. The only two offices that were open— well, the library would remain open, of course, and Jack Shirley's office had a skeleton staff during the lunch—everything else closed down. I put up with that for about a year and a half and I finally decided—the governor actually had made some recommendation about the offices staying open, and I figured, hell, if the governor could decree it, you know, the University ought to at least follow suit. And I got more flack on campus about that, I guess, from—and essentially it affected the classified people more than anybody else, clerical people. They were the ones who got to keep the office open. What I said was, where you have two people in the office you ought to try to keep it open. But where I had the most trouble on campus was not anywhere else except here in my very own office; you know, just a total rejection of the concept. Even today, you know, the notion of staggered lunch hours still is a mystery [laughs]. They used to go eat lunch together a big part of the time and that destroyed that, you know.

A secretary has to protect any executive, whether it's me or anybody else that works in the public, you know. You can't see everybody that wants to see you. With them, I had to see everybody; they couldn't handle anything and so the end result was, anybody that called with a problem, it wound up either being a phone call with me, or more frequently an appointment with me. And of course, most of them were fairly routine things and I was very new, so I didn't know what to tell 'em anyway. I had to find out where to send 'em to get the information they needed. And I found, you know, I'd have appointments every half hour throughout the entire day. I kid you not; every half hour. You better look at some early calendars and see how I was

working nights, weekends—I still do, but you know, then I was just tryin' to stay caught up and my days were just blocked in solid. And most of it was hearing problems and telling the person where to go find a solution. But then I had to find out, you know; I had to go learn *myself* where they had to go which took considerable time.

I was really desperate, I guess; I was casting about trying to figure out some way to improve my staff and decided finally that I'd recruit someone that would step in and function, more or less, in Clara's—or what I thought Clara's role *ought* to be—not *ought* to be, not based on a job description, but what a really competent, dedicated, interested person could make of the job. You know, anytime you have a job description, you start out with a description and you hope the person makes something more of it than that.

I don't know how it was done in the past, but, you know, the presidency here is kind of a man-killing job in the sense that the President has damn little help. Well, for example, I've been tryin' to find time for two and a half years to revise our administrative manual. And I swear, there is nobody on this campus that I feel comfortable turning that over to do, in part because a lot of people have their own particular axes they try to grind. You know, we asked different departments to update their administrative manual sections, and what came back was an attempt to win there every battle they've lost over the last twenty years by puttin' it in the administrative manual. And I reacted rather strongly. But essentially that system doesn't work, basically. It's hard to find somebody that really has the competence, intimate knowledge, especially something that ought to be assigned to the Vice President [for] Business, for example. I got upset before about the difficulties I've experienced in the staffing of that office. I'm not detracting at all

from Ed's strengths, but there are some things the office needs that Ed's not supplying, and you know, my eventual plans to reorient the office somewhat—. Of course, I think I said before that here in my own immediate office, Jean had resigned, Jim Anderson went out, and I was confronted with selecting a new administrative secretary.

Anyway, I decided finally what I had to have was an administrative assistant, someone who knew or could learn the administrative routine, who could work well with people, who—and obviously I wanted someone to manage the office, too. Oh, along in October of '75, I began (about fourteen months I'd been here), I began planning that way. And on one of my trips back to Arkansas, I visited my daughter and Shelba was there that night. My daughter and Shelba worked in the same office back in Arkansas. In fact, I think that Shelba kinda babysat her as much as anything else—my daughter's not—. Well, that's another story.

Anyway, she was unhappy in the job that she had; it was essentially one that I had brought her back to; she'd quit work earlier. She worked for me at the University of Arkansas, first as a secretary and then as an administrative assistant, that type job, in the political science department. Her husband finished law school and they moved from Little Rock and I moved from Little Rock a little bit later on to take over the director of administration for Win Rockefeller. And then when Bumpers came into office, oh, she'd worked on the campaign or something. And she finally quit working. And we had the Emergency Employment Act, that program to implement, and I needed someone that I had confidence in who could essentially organize the administrative routine of the program. Then Dale had decreed a terribly complex system where every county judge (seventy-five of 'em) and every mayor (a hundred and

something) would be a sub-agent. That's a lot of sub-agents, each one sort of an independent contractor for the governor's office—the central program.

So I persuaded her to come back to work for the state— or come to work for the state, to implement that. She did an excellent job. In fact, we offered her the directorship of the program and she did not take it because her husband was goin' to DeQueen—a little small town in Arkansas—to set up a law practice, and she moved with him, of course. She did retain an area directorship of the program and later transferred back. Anyway, she was unhappy with her job and she had gotten a divorce about six or seven months before that, and I think, kinda wanted to get out of Arkansas.

So I asked her, if she'd be interested if I did move on the administrative assistant to become a candidate for that job. In all candor, she wasn't very interested. The more I thought about it the better I liked the idea, so I did a pretty good selling job. I guess we'd already begun to search for that job at that point in time, or at least we had it ready to go to a search level—we had the job description requirements worked out at that point in time. I think that the events there are a matter of public record at this point in time, and not much need to cover that. I had a screening committee on campus that didn't have too good a response to the ad, frankly; we had about forty or fifty, and most of them were retired military types that were looking for a berth to stay retired in, not at all what I had in mind.

Anyway, she's done an excellent job in the sense of *protecting* me. People on campus have learned that they get things—if they really want to get something *done* if that's what they want, they are better off to work through her than they are to come and see me. And of

course, the more she learns of the system, the more valuable she becomes. And she's learned quite a bit of it. She's a quick study.

No question, I've used her to protect me from the office staff out front. She's a buffer, and because they *drive me up the wall*. I never have worked with people with their attitudes; I can't adjust to it. To me, a job should be important and interesting in and of itself, and the attitude that's reflected in your work and so on, is just something that I cannot tolerate. I very early on learned that trying to get rid of them in Nevada civil service would be an *impossible* thing to accomplish, really. Clara was the only one I really evaluated. Her job description called for her to evaluate the others. That's no longer true. Shelba now evaluates all of them. They all work for Shelba independently, although we haven't got that across entirely, that each one of them works *for* Shelba and not the other way around.

Shelba improved the office a great deal. I think she improved—you know, I think it took about two days for people to catch on that she was the way to get things done, you know. I use her as an administrative assistant totally; she's just an extension of me, and she responds well. She had been at work with me long enough that she knows how I would react to most situations. Then, she knows enough to know when not to assume that she can—knows when to come and ask me before she proceeds.

And since Bob Gorrell has joined the office (we'll come back and discuss that in a different connection) but, since he's joined the office, I think we have (with the Vice President up on this floor in part of this office suite) —I think we have a very excellent arrangement. Undoubtedly, we're going to make some plans, some changes in the outer office. It's just got to happen. Since he's here—you know, at times it was so bad that, I guess, at

times I'd begun to think it was just me, you know. And we brought Bob over without warning him what to expect; he didn't have any forewarning, and I think he's even more amazed than I am. And we have decided that something must be done, just what, we're not sure. And they're very pleasant people, you know, most of the time. There's a little bit of gossiping that goes on; [I] had a little bit of trouble with information that should have been confidential in the office getting out, and it had to be through the outer office—no question about it. That sort of thing is awfully hard to control.

In the back part of the office, Bob and Shelba and I have a very easy-going relationship. If we had people in the outer office that would adapt to the pattern that we have, it would be a very good office, from the standpoint of efficiency, from the standpoint of, oh, a place that people would like to come into I think. They would feel welcome, all of that. And we'll get there. We'll get there.

We had a little bit of a trauma when the—well, the other change took place in about a year's time—a little bit more than a year, about fourteen months it was that I did ask Jim Anderson to resign as Academic Vice President.

You know, the only time I didn't have thirty-minute appointments were the two hours a day I spent with Jim. [Laughs] It's true. He'd block out time on my calendar; he'd block two hours every day, or every other day at the outside and come up to *read to me*. I exaggerate, I exaggerate [laughing]. But all the things that Jim did that I found irritating, he would bring up a letter, say a request from a dean, and sit and read me the request rather than route it up, hand it to me—"this is a request, I recommend acceptance," the way Bob and I work, and we work very easily. You

know, I can read faster than anybody can read to me, and this puts constraints on my time which everyone should be able to see. That's the one thing that sticks out and I emphasize it too much, but it was the [laughs]—.

Anyway, I never developed the kind of confidence—and I tried—never developed the kind of confidence in Jim where I felt like I could really trust him to make decisions that were really important to the University. Jim is a highly rule-oriented person; he has to almost create a rule to make a decision and of course, rules really provide the basis for exceptions. If you had a rule for every decision, you wouldn't need administrators, basically. Incidentally, I am essentially a management-by-exception type of person. You know, the stuff that—most of the things that take place should be routine and they should never reach this office. Now, the way we're structured, an awful lot of routine stuff has to come to this office, including travel requests. I have to sign every out-of-state travel request that is made in the University. And those are routine, you know. I don't check them; nobody in the office checks them. They come here and they are signed. Letters, you know, contracts should be routine. All too often they weren't. Now they *are*. Once they clear—when I sign a contract now, I look for one thing. If it's got Bob Gorrell's signature, I sign it. That's the way it should be in my estimation, which is to say, I shouldn't have to sign it at all. I should be able to delegate to *him* the authority to sign contracts, but the way the Regents' bylaws and so on are constructed, they've never seen fit to permit that kind of delegation from the President down.

Anyway, after a year of struggling and I think, really trying, I really decided the first summer Marilyn went back to Arkansas and spent seven weeks in our cabin back there. joined her for two; she drove back and I

flew—[laughs] both ways. But I really, when I got away from it—from the job— for that two weeks' time—away—I call in everyday, but enough perspective to sort out what I had to do to (things I felt I had to do) and to replace Jim was one of 'em. I came back and worked at it two or three more months and did ask him finally to resign.

Some concern on—you know, there's no doubt, I knew there'd be some repercussions. Elizabeth Anderson, I think, still doesn't speak very frequently to me when we see each other socially. I think she hasn't spoken to my wife since, if she could avoid it. [She] somehow blames Marilyn for it.

But anyway, I planned to leave that office vacant. So much of the—it was a strange office. And my analysis was it had gone through so many permutations as executive vice president, administrative vice president, academic vice president—certain little functions had accrued to the office in each of those reincarnations, and nothing was ever sloughed off. Too many areas that I felt were critical to the success of the presidential office, and to the success of the University too, I think, had been subordinated to that office and decisions had been made at a level lower in the structure than they should. You know, how you organize (my academic field is organizational theory, basically), organization is strictly a tool, you know, in terms of formal structures. You have people report in certain places mainly because you want to have problems resolved at a certain level, and that means you want to have certain inputs. You want to have certain points of view brought to bear on the problem.

Admissions and Records had been totally subordinated to academic administration, not just academic considerations or academic policy which it should be; it shouldn't be a

policy-making agency. But, for example, the recruiting program, I'm still struggling with our recruiting program. Recruiting has—is such a bad word; but that's what it is, you know, we recruit students. Our recruiting program was a very dry, stereotyped thing, talking about academic programs. And of course, that's not what sells students on the University. They assume they all have academic programs and most of them aren't—well, you have a few that are really looking for quality. Most of 'em assume that the place they want to go has the quality they want and they look for other things, and those things were totally missing from our program—from our recruiting. They aren't now. We haven't gone nearly far enough I don't think, in trying to oh, project a good positive image of the University. The types of things that kids are most concerned about in looking for a place to go to school—activities, living arrangements, sports, the social life, generally. By the way I think that's an awfully important part of the college experience—the things that take place outside the formal classroom should also be a very important part of the educational experience.

Extension is another area where we just *dried* up in the Extension area—General University Extension as opposed to Cooperative Extension service—and essentially had been totally subordinated to the campus. Part of that, oh, the drawing inward process that I had thought I detected at that time, and still think that I did.

Anyway, by leaving the office vacant, you know, by one stroke all those people reported directly to me: Audio Visual, Library, Extension. It was a way of getting a look at their concerns that I could probably not have gotten any other way, you know, if I had replaced someone in that job, even if I had restructured some, I wouldn't have

really known, I think, what restructuring I needed to do, but by having them report to me I created a tremendous burden on me for a while. But by having them report to me, I got to learn more about them and the problems they had. If one of them had a concern, a policy matter they wanted changed, I could say, “Okay, I want this person and this person and this person to come in and talk about this, you know, with us,” and pick out the people I thought were relevant. That's the way I operate, by the way.

An example, getting back to recruitment, I asked—well, Harry Gianneschi is someone I recruited. I think that's a very able young man, who was in the field of recruiting at Western Illinois. And I discussed my concerns about the recruiting program. In fact I asked him to schedule a couple of visits with our recruiting team to go and give it a critique. But he also had a film that he helped develop at Western Illinois. So I asked Jack Shirley and John Halvorson and Donald Potter to sit in with Harry and I and view that film. And I kinda liked it. We wouldn't want a copy it here; we're not Western Illinois. It's more the direction of the type of thing that I want, so I asked well, Jack—I had not seen the latest version of our slide show, and Jack thought I ought to see that and so did Don Potter. And he's right, I should. I saw the one a year ago, but not the recent update. So we scheduled another meeting and I decided well, who are we gonna bring in on this? I decided well, John Garberson in journalism is a pretty good PR type guy, Jim McCormick over in art impressed me a great deal from the standpoint of aesthetics and also he's a mover, you know. He gets things done. Dan Tone over in medical science—people that I respect their expertise. And we're gonna do the thing over again, broaden it to include the slide show that we're using, the film, then sit

around and knock it around and see what type of a out of—oh, Bob Gorrell will be involved, too—what type of thing—. So essentially, in dealing with a problem I try to pick points of view that I want represented—I think *need* to be represented—in solving the problem, or in finding the solution to the problem.

Well, the Honorary Degree Committee, the other day, you know, no way did I want to formalize that into a faculty committee. I did want some faculty input and I picked you and Gene [Grotegut] to sit on that committee because both of you are native Nevadans, you have academic interests, but your interests are much broader than that. And they are simply two points of view I felt should be represented, that would help in making a good decision.

Anyway, that was a very interesting experience having the Academic Vice President's office vacant. Initially, I'd probably planned to leave it vacant longer than I did. Part of the reason for not doing it was, the workload was just too much. It was more than I could handle, given the fact that Shelba had not yet settled in, so I hadn't really got around the problem that I had with scheduling of my time. I was still seeing more people than I ought to. I still do probably, but that's a part of the job, you know.

One thing that I decided during the time that I was studying there was one of the reasons for the problems we had was there was an awful lot of duplication between the Academic Vice President's office and the President's office and—of clerical work particularly, filing, all that sort of thing. I decided that it would be good to have the two offices merged. You know, the Academic Vice President should be the second in command. That's the person that should be in charge when the President's not here, as opposed to the Business Vice President—Business and Student Services, I see as essentially support

areas. You know, the academic area's our mission, mission area.

[I] began looking around for some way to rearrange things and we considered—oh God, what all we considered. Finally, I decided I'd take over Ed Pine's space and remodel the offices just the way they are now. They worked out pretty well. We're too cramped. We need more space, but we need to have room probably for one more clerical person. Even then we'd be short one; we have one and a half less than we had before when the offices were separated though. And I may move some work around, and even do away with the need for that. We're still in the process of reorganizing, and I anticipate some other changes being made in the near future.

THOUGHTS ON ADMINISTRATION

Let me talk about the philosophy of administration for a little bit. If I could sort of categorize or create a false dichotomy, one that doesn't exist in real life, but between people that think of management in terms of prerogatives and management in terms of a process, I'm very much a believer of management in terms of process. It *is* a process. It doesn't matter where it takes place, at which level, as long as management decisions are made. Now if they're not made somewhere else, I will. This year's work program, you know, the deans did not deal responsibly with departmental requests, and whatever the departments requested, the deans just submitted. Would you believe that the requests for work program this time were even *larger* than the biennial budget request that we worked with last year? And the departments' biennial budget request bore very little relationship to work program requests. Of course, I think you'd almost find a random correlation—sure no correlation.

There'd be many over and below. I think no one even went back to look at their budget request at the time they were formulating their work program requests. And the end result was that their work program requests were much, much higher despite what everyone knew we were working with—the legislature, and so forth—or maybe because of it—than they had requested. For their biennial budget, where the deans had reviewed it and eliminated some items on the biennial budget request. You know, if a dean does that, they are simply not doing their job. What they're doing is passing the responsibility on up to me. I don't like to do the cutting, you know, but somebody has to. Now, you know, I guess that the prerogatives come into play when the process breaks down. Or I guess maybe "the buck stops here" philosophy had to be brought within a certain dollar limit. The deans did not do a thing to contribute to that process.

Decisions ought to be made as close as they can be to where the work is being done. If they are not made there, they must be made somewhere else. And you know, the real problem is to get that process to working. And I think we're making some headway, the work program experience to the contrary notwithstanding. We're finding we have holes in the system. I've already mentioned to you, I think, this business that we spend all our time approving courses and any dean that wants to change his curriculum, he just sends in a change in the catalog copy. Well, the process doesn't work there. There ought to be a way of stopping that sort of thing. Getting the review you need. And I think we have got on top of that now. It will not happen again. God knows what's happened already, wholesale revision of curricula without any kind of review by any outside group, any university level review anyway. I was assuming that

the Registrar, when he controls the catalog, would refer everything back to make sure it had been approved by the proper authority. But it turned out that that wasn't happening. They would check to see if the course changes had been approved, but *never* check to see if the curricular change had been approved. We strain at gnats and swallow camels, sometimes.

Exercising prerogatives is a very painful process, anyway. It's awfully hard to decide whether to cut a philosopher or a political scientist. Those are both from the same college, so it's much easier to let the Dean of Arts and Science make that decision. That type of thing is one I probably wouldn't force a dean of arts and sciences to decide, but I'd certainly want a recommendation from the dean. I'd implicate myself on something like that.

The simple fact is that there are not enough hours in the day to make every decision of the University here in this office. The time just doesn't exist to do all those things. And you know, I was appalled when I came here, I still am appalled, at the number of things that have to be decided here in this office, and I think we've gone a *long* way in changing a lot of that, but it's still—. The number of times I have to sign my name is absurd, really. I spend probably a half an hour a day affixing my name to papers that I glance at, but I really can't say I've read or understand totally what I'm signing. If they're personnel appointments, I assume that— I told Bob Gorrell that, you know, "Anytime anything comes bouncing back here, I'm gonna come crawl on you, 'cause when I see 'em I look for only one thing on these and that's your signature." (And that's not quite true. Frequently I buck things back for more—but basically, I look for his signature and if it's there, then I don't look any further.)

Ed Pine, the same way, in his area. If I have to second guess my people all the time, I may need different people, you know? And I think with those two people, I've got a couple of pretty good people. That's one thing I feel very strongly about. The other element that really, I think I regard as important or even more important, that is the main effort that should be exercised here in this office is the external relationship. And that includes the governor, it includes the legislature, it includes the businessmen downtown. And by the way, I don't think that Fred Davis Chamber of Commerce thing is *at all* typical.* I had innumerable phone calls from people who wanted to do something to counteract—business people who wanted to do something to counteract—that. And I told 'em, "If you wanta do something, call your favorite legislator and tell him to vote for our appropriation bill." My decision was that it served our purpose to quiet the thing down as fast as we possibly could. We did our best not to encourage anyone to stir it up. Whenever anyone talked to us, you know, making passing comments, we tried to laugh it off, smile it off, or whatever. Any organization has got to be placed in productive relationships with all those groups that make up its environment, it just *has* to be. You can't satisfy all of 'em, but you gotta try. You gotta try.

The more time I spend on internal regulations and regulating, the less time I have to spend on external. And if you count the social activities we're involved in which I think are all business, as far as the University is concerned—we don't do much, really, that doesn't have a University relationship; we rarely ever go to a party just to go to a party. We *had* one recently, but it was one of those rare occasions we had a party just to have a party. And we just invited folks. That's the first time since we've been here that we've

done that, really. There's been some business consideration involved in each one of 'em. It becomes a eighty-ninety hour a week job, really.

Last Saturday morning I spent two and a half hours down with a Student Leadership Conference, for example, and there's something like that almost every weekend. There's one weekend in every four at least I'm involved at least for six or seven hours in the National College [of the State Judiciary] over here. That's important only because—the National College in itself is not that important, but it's important that the University maintain the identity because there're so many other people that think the National College is important, the Fleischmann people, all kinds of people. I don't really contribute a thing to the success of the National College programs there; that's really a public relations job with all those people there that do support the National College. I'm exaggerating there, obviously, but that's the motivational set.

I'm a great believer in discussion. At least I think I am. I don't believe the committees make decisions very effectively, though. I think decisions kinda have to flow out of the head of one person. I think a lot of discussion needs to take place ahead of time, and I like decisions by consensus, if you can get 'em. But, you know, if a decision is needed you shouldn't not make it simply because you can't get consensus. I think one of our big problems here on this campus, and this especially relates to our dealing with the Chancellor's office, is that he sets timetables that don't allow us time to develop consensus here on the campus. I'm

*Mr. Davis, a Chamber of Commerce official, severely criticized the University administration in a public statement.

not saying if we had more time, we'd always support what the Chancellor wants done—not at all—but things that the—. Well, you know, the work load deal, the flap we went through a year ago. Hell, our faculty came back and adopted that on its own. You know, we didn't have time to discuss it; it was cast in an adversary relationship. All sorts of things happened to bring it to naught when it was first proposed. And then we came right back around and wrote it into our bylaws, and probably many of our faculty were really surprised because they'd voted so strongly against it before. It's not cast in exactly the same language it was in, but the very same idea's behind it. And I think that that style

I don't think authoritarian administration has any place in the University. You know, we essentially as an institution, are dedicated to the—and I said this in a speech one time, here on campus—that the only alternative to power is reason. And I think that that's what we're dedicated to that *reason* shall prevail in human affairs. Reason presupposes discussion. Anyhow, I'm not being Pollyannaish about that. Obviously, *interests* are very important elements too. But you know, you can prove—decision can do two things. It can indicate what's the best course of action, or it can indicate who's the strongest contender. A decision that merely indicates who's got the most authority, who's the strongest contender, doesn't really mean very much, it seems to me. What you want are good decisions. And that fits in, by the way, with my notion about its being—it's possible to have creative bargaining, that life is not a zero sum game, that you can reach solutions that add up to more than zero. The very fact that I win doesn't mean that you lose a proportionate amount. I don't accept that philosophy. I never have. A good decision is one in which both parties gain the most possible. Most decision

theory, by the way, assumes the opposite. It assumes that whatever one person wins the other person loses a proportionate amount. The van Neuman-Morgenstern Theory of Gains is based upon that premise, and their theory of gains lies at the base of most modern decision theory.

FACULTY RELATIONS

LEADERS, GOVERNANCE

What kinds of people did you identify as the opinion leaders, and the ones who were causing, or trying to solve these problems when you arrived here?

In the community or on the campus?

On the campus to begin with.

Well, I think, there were certain groups that were more vocal. Jim Richardson, I suppose, was one of the most notable faculty leaders. He was gone the [first] year I was here. He was on sabbatical the first year I was here. The person who was Faculty Senate chairman, Pat Beaulieu, was the person I worked with most closely. And I assumed that Pat was kind of a faculty leader. I learned later that he was not so much a part of that mainstream as I originally thought. But the group that I identified as a spokesman for that—even then I—and I'm not sure I see a faculty spokesman. I find a lot of different faculty spokespeople, you know.

After Marilyn and I came out to be interviewed for the job, we then came back about a week's trip the first of June in '74, to meet people in the community primarily, but also from the faculty. I explicitly asked for people then to set up an extra-official evening. I wanted to meet some of the younger faculty. It seems that I spent a lot of time with deans and directors and that sort of thing, but I didn't see any of the rank and file faculty. And that evening, (they had] a little party at the Grotegut's. And I don't recall why Gene was the one, why he decided he should hold it, but then the Richardsons were there, the Ginsburgs, the Beaulieus; I'm trying to recall if John Marschall was there. But you recognize now, this is a group of people that (not entirely, but many of them) are NSP members. I think they're a group of people that are generally and *genuinely* concerned about the University—the quality of the University.

But, you know, that group is by no means, and I don't say they are spokesmen for the faculty, because there are so many faculty who do their job, who are not involved in campus

politics. In fact, I guess, the last test of that group in there—they come out of the Arts and Science college, generally, not entirely, but generally—the last test was on our Dean of Arts and Science search committee, and the ones of that group that were to be chosen for the search committee, weren't. They were left off the committee almost entirely. Probably that was arranged, but you know, a little bit of a campaign going on, I think. But it's still awfully hard to find a spokesman for the faculty, even the Faculty Senate. One of the difficulties a president has in dealing with faculty is that the formal channel is through the Faculty Senate. But even there, the degree to which the Faculty Senate represents the faculty in anything other than a formal way is fairly minimal, really. Most of the faculty are off doing their jobs and, you know, so on.

Bob Gorrell, I think, was identified by me as being someone the faculty had a great deal (at least in the College of Arts and Science)—had a great deal of confidence in. You know, the University of Nevada, Reno—it comes back to the structure of the University. The College of Arts and Science is a very important part of this University, internally, anyway. In a sense, this may be in part the source of our problem with the community. In some states that I've been in, the more technical, professional types of education have been in a different type of school than the main arts and science thrust in the state. Here it's all in one school. University of Nevada, Reno, was *the* University for so many years, and the professional schools have always remained fairly small up until quite recently. [College of] Education boomed in the '60s and [College of] Business is booming now, but you can go back just a very few years and find where that was not true; that College of Arts and Sciences was *really* the dominant, even more than now, I think, the dominant

school. The very structure of the University makes it that way.

At the same time, the community tends to identify more with the professional schools than it does with the College of Arts and Sciences and feels somewhat more antipathy toward the College of Arts and Science than it does the professional schools. I would like to see more faculty leadership coming out of the professional schools. I think it would help a great deal to have some strong faculty leaders coming out of the professional schools, other than just the department of economics over in the College of Business. You know, that really is an Arts and Science subject which happens to be in the College of Business.

As far as anyone that can really speak for the faculty, I think that there are people, there are faculty who can speak and other faculty listen. There are some who appear to be faculty leaders because they are very activist and manage to move out in front. You have an Ed Barmettler, for example, who at least up until the time he became dean—I guess you would still say he was kind of a faculty leader, but his leadership certainly, does not reflect support in his own College [of Agriculture] very much. It's a leadership that's based upon other kinds of support. You know, a really good leader of the faculty, [is] one that could relate to his own school as well as other schools on campus, it seems to me; Ed doesn't really fill that role. You know, Ed's been a big help since I've been here. He does—he *is* a faculty leader in that sense.

But leaderships are essentially people, you know, that select communication. I think, good leaders are the ones that do select communication between this office or other offices on campus and the faculty in general. A good faculty leader's gotta be someone that does have a lot of contacts with other faculty, and I mean "leader" there as opposed to Alan

Ryall, you know. Alan tends to try to spend as much time in his lab as he can, or out in the field, you know, rather than rubbing elbows with his colleagues. Yet, when Alan does say something, then people listen.

Okay, faculty relationships—we'll get into that anyway. An indication of faculty leaders—you know, there are so many that it's hard to pick one or two. The one thing that I learned quickly (not quickly, not as quickly as I should), the Senate chairman, the person who was chairman when I came here does not really qualify as a faculty leader and you sort of assume that people that occupy formal offices do. Pat [Beaulieu] was a very easy person to work with—had a good mind, a good analytical mind, could shift in and out of his Faculty Senate role and played his role very well, I thought. But then he could also—he could relax and talk over a problem where he could just shift in and out of that role. I think someone in that job, it'd be nice to have someone that you, well, you know, and I haven't felt that way with either (I've had three now, Pat Beaulieu, my first year; Gene Grotegut, the second year and Jim Richardson, the third year, current year). I haven't felt as comfortable with either Gene or Jim as I did with Pat, and I look back kinda longingly sometimes, you know. Pat could represent himself as Faculty Senate chairman and also at the same—you know, advice and, "What do you think about this?" and throw out some wild idea, and he recognized it as such and it didn't get reported back to other groups, you know, that I was proposing to do so-and-so.

Both Gene and Jim are a little bit more political in the sense of looking for an advantage vis-a-vis the administration. Pat was totally protective and totally supportive of the faculty, but yet there was a desire to cooperate to get a job done that is not

lacking in Gene or Jim, but you are never sure whether they're coming from the NSP standpoint or the Faculty Senate standpoint, or the *faculty* standpoint. And of course, the Faculty Senate is something different from the faculty. Whether they're pursuing the advantage of the foreign language department or the sociology department, or just what it is they're after, you know, in any given situation. Well, whether or not it's true, my concern for that affects the relationship that I have with them, you know. At least that's the way it is.

I guess the nearest thing I've found to a person that I really thought of as a true faculty leader is probably Alan Ryall. And he was not political at all, you know. He had tremendous stature, what he did was respected, he served on a couple of committees that I thought, you know, one of them he was criticized on—I forget which one it was—the sabbatical leave committee he was chairman of—but anyway, he handled himself extremely well there, I think. The criticism didn't come about because Alan Ryall was chairman, but because the result the committee reached wasn't what Hussain Haddawy wanted the committee to reach. It wouldn't have mattered who was chairman. You know, Alan Ryall was the kind of faculty leadership that's quite different from that represented by Jim Richardson, for example. And it's not at all to do with their respective academic credentials. It's more a reflection of how they go about accomplishing what their objectives are.

I think most of the problem areas, and we've had some, have been—and you know I'm probably oversimplifying—but faculty getting used to a different administrator and that administrator getting used to a group of faculty. You know, the faculty frequently—not just faculty, anyone in organization who's frequently expressed a certain type of desire, but when they get it they're really not

sure they really want it, you know. I'm not afraid to make decisions; sometimes I don't like to make 'em precipitously. I sometimes push things on the back burner and let them simmer for a while before I'm ready to decide. Critical things I try not to do that with, but even so I'd rather make a *late* decision than a *had* decision. I mean that I'm not *afraid* to make decisions; I do like them to be good ones. But I think the faculty wanted somebody to make decisions, and when they get one I'm not sure they really like it, you know. It's all right as long as the -decision goes your way, you know.

Jim Richardson—I needled Jim one day. He—you know, democratic procedures are important, yet Jim came as a part of a delegation to see me, to ask me to overrule a decision of the department of psychology not to grant tenure to a person in the department who is a *social* psychologist, you know, because they viewed him as important to their program. And, you know, when it came to something that he wanted done, then administrative dictate is what should be done, you know. There's just—*use* that power. And I tried to explain, you know, that there are certain procedures that you have to observe. He couldn't see that.

You know, I'm sure there must be faculty that are extremely skeptical of me. I don't know who they are, and that's an honest-to-God truthful statement. There's no one on the faculty whom I dislike. There are some that have caused me more problems than others—Catherine Smith over in music, Sam Basta. I feel sorry mainly where Sam's concerned. But I really don't know of a single person here that I'm not glad to see when I meet 'em, you know—that I don't feel reasonably comfortable with. As I say, I'm sure there are people that don't feel that way about me, but I really don't know who they are. I think that's

good. It may be that I'm just not observant enough, but at the same time, if I knew. that someone hated my guts, you know, why I'd have a difficult time—it would probably affect my dealing with him and it really shouldn't, you know. So I'm pleased that I don't—.

To this day, I don't know who NSP members are on campus. I know who a few of them are, but not very—only the ones that occupied public office and identified themselves as NSP: Neal Ferguson, Glen Atkinson, Jim Richardson, Gene Grotegut, people who've identified themselves to me either directly or by the offices they held (in their public behavior). I just don't know. I don't know if we have a hundred and twenty or two hundred members or just what—fifty, sixty. I have no idea and don't really wanta know, you know? Although I'm definitely opposed to unions, faculty unions—I've made no bones about that—I wouldn't—you know, if someone offered me a chance to look at the list of NSP members, I wouldn't take it, I guess. It's not a relevant consideration, you know, really; it's not.

You asked a question about the Faculty Senate meetings. For some reason lately, I haven't gotten as involved in as many of 'em as I need to and should. I've had conflicts; I've been in Carson City on Senate meeting days and any number of things. I think that my involvement—when I am there my involvement is—the way we're structured is probably the way I want it structured, I don't know. I can recall teaching in a university where the president of the university presided over the faculty senate, and I thought that was quite inappropriate to do so. And besides that, I think that being a presider kinda inhibits any comments you want to make. I feel probably freer to discuss matters *not* being a chairman of the Faculty Senate than I would be if I were chairman. And you know, I express my views,

sometimes perhaps too candidly, but if I feel about some things some way, I say it. This year, the last four or five months I haven't attended as often as I should. Now I do have Bob to go in my place, and I think the Faculty Senate knows—I can use Bob as a substitute there where I couldn't use Jim Anderson because the Senate knows that whatever Bob says I will support, and that's because I think he generally says things that I would say—not always, but generally what things I would say—under similar circumstances. Maybe not blindly—there may be something very crucial that I would not, but in general, we think alike. We do have a good rapport.

On the “Questions for the President”—that was an innovation we introduced last year, Gene Grotegut—Gene or Jim, one, or both, devised it. I think in part—and very candidly, I think in part—it was an attempt to embarrass the President by asking him some very sensitive-type things in public. But not entirely. It could have been a fairly useful thing. Frequently, it was a question of somebody had an axe to grind that they'd have been better off to come and see me individually and ask about it. [I wondered how that came about, because it is new.]

Well, unfortunately, I haven't got any answer—the last three meetings, because I've missed three consecutive meetings. I think Bob has tried to answer a few of those but, I really have, I've missed three consecutive meetings and you know, that's unforgivable except that in each case I was doing something that had to be done for the University where I just couldn't—where I had to make a judgment that where I was supposed to be otherwise was more important than being there.

Apropos of the comment that the “Questions to the President, I'm not sure that was—Gene Grotegut instituted that—I'm not

really sure that it was his intent at the time that he did it. Certainly, I felt that some of the questions that were asked or listed there, you know, were of the “have you stopped beating your wife” category, where there was really no good answer for it. I guess my comment was based upon the unanswerable type of questions. Anytime a new executive comes to an organization—a new person comes to an organization—there's always a period of testing, you know. I think that's probably gone on long enough here, myself, I think the faculty pretty well—at least the active ones, you know that have more contacts, pretty well know where I'm at and where I'm comin' from on most issues at this point in time. I certainly haven't always responded to Faculty Senate challenges, et cetera, as fast as they would like, but obviously many of their concerns are such that you *can't* provide that kind of responses. I can't say that I've minded 'em—the “Questions to the President,” I haven't minded 'em at all. I don't have anything that I try to conceal from the faculty particularly. I've been charged with being a little too candid sometimes, but I never have really tried to conceal things from the Senate certainly.

I do feel quite free to take part in Faculty Senate meetings—perhaps a little bit freer than some of the group would like. Obviously, the Faculty Senate is not really a truly representative body because of the rather strong NSP influence in the Faculty Senate. The bodies aren't quite coterminous, but you know, as far as the stands they take, they come very close to being coterminous. I don't really know who all the NSP members on campus are. I know a few of 'em, but not all. It seems that the faculty committees frequently come out very close to what NSP positions [are] (these are committees that report to the Senate particularly) and then the final position's taken by the Senate. So I have my doubts as to

how effective a spokesman the Faculty Senate is for the faculty as a whole— not effective in the sense of truly representing faculty attitude throughout the entire University. I'm rather suspicious, and I think that over time they have, well, I'm a little bit critical.

I just came from Doug Jackson's funeral a few minutes ago. Doug Jackson served on the Senate ever since I've been here. He's been a member of the executive board ever since I've been here. I felt that frequently he adopted positions that he didn't really subscribe to, and I was a little disgruntled today when not a single member of the faculty showed up at Doug's funeral—of the Faculty Senate, the people he'd worked with on that body over the years. There wasn't a single person there, and I found that a little bit—well, annoying, shall we say? People that knew him, obviously, better than I did and I felt there should have been some representation because of that long association.

I think the NSP influence in the Senate is shown also by, you know—they aren't really concerned with academic policy, very much. The concerns of the Faculty Senate are oriented almost entirely towards salaries, fringe benefits, material welfare of the faculty as opposed to control over academic policies. You know, my conception of the Faculty Senate, it should be *the* place where academic policies are aired. That's what it's all about, it seems to me. And almost anything you wanta get *done* here—say you wanted to change a major curriculum change, you could do it arbitrarily and I doubt (unless somebody *complained* specifically), the Faculty Senate would never raise a question. At least I get that feeling, you know. That preoccupation with faculty welfare is a quite legitimate concern of the Faculty Senate, but it shouldn't be—it should be far from being the *only* concern or at least the *paramount* concern, it seems

to me if they're really gonna be an effective instrument of university governance. Oh, campus politics—I'll come back to faculty governance in a minute. You know, the only problem is, I think, that probably a large part of the campus is abdicated political activity to a few; that usually happens, I think. But I'd like to see some broader involvement. In part, that deals with the next thing, the observation of faculty governance system.

I guess, in my own mind, a big complaint with the Faculty Senate is that it's almost abdicated its role in terms of the academic policymaker of the institution in its overriding concern for faculty welfare, fringe benefits and so on. It's become a sort of a—well, the union attitude has pervaded very much the Faculty Senate meetings. And you know, they skip over things that I consider, at least, *major*, questions of major importance on academic policy and the policy-making process. And then, you know, debate for hours the most trivial little matters that affect faculty welfare in the sense of material benefits to the faculty. Get totally exercised over worries that never happen, you know. Seems to me that they almost spend their time dreaming up things that might happen, you know, and then worrying about them—an enormous waste of time there.

In other aspects of faculty governance, in our search for our Dean of Arts and Science, we asked many of the candidates what they felt and one of them said we were "choking with democracy." I don't think that's true. I think that, you know, we do have more faculty involvement than most campuses I've been on. It has its pluses and minuses.

I don't use committees the way that some people do. Certainly I don't refer something to a committee to avoid ever having to make a decision on it. I think that happens sometimes. Certain committees have been

more important than others during the time that I've been here. Certain problems have been more urgent than others. Student Affairs Board, I suppose, has been one of the best committees I've had and we've had some rather important problems—the dorms, the alcohol problem, a few others that the now three different Student Affairs Boards have worked with very well, very effectively. I think that committee has performed best over the three years I've been here.

Some of the committees are formed at the insistence of special interests and they are designed to promote special interests and frequently to the exclusion of all other special interests. They see themselves that way. In a sense that's right and proper. It obviously has to be—you know, if the International Studies Board wants to do something that's dear to their heart, the fact that they report to the president should not give them a special forum or special access to the exclusion of all the other types of interest that maybe are not organized and represented by a committee. A strong pitch from the Whittell Forest Board, for example, to purchase—to find some money to purchase some land up in the Whittell Forest.. The arguments are very forceful and I think we'll try to help them. But certainly the fact that they do have an organization gives them an advantage, you know, and they have access to the President that anyone else would *have*, but they wouldn't assume that they had, being a committee reporting to the President gives them a kind of a direct access.

We've eliminated some committees, not many. We converted, well for example, the Hydrology-Hydrogeology Board. The way we chose members was, well, people nominate themselves, the Faculty Senate recommends, and I finally make a selection. That's a foolish way to choose a board like the Hydrology-

Hydrogeology which is essentially a group of people involved in that program controlling the program. They ought to be able to be set up where they can pretty much preempt members—co-opt members, I should say, to join over time. We have removed that from the appointed type committees. I think we'll make some other changes as we go along, in committees, usually in trying to scale down the number. We have too many and try to scale the number down.

You know, if people are interested in tryin' to get together, and talking and planning a curricular change, for example, they shouldn't have to have a committee designated to do that. If the interest is there, they ought to be able to do it without being called a committee, you know. One of the most important committees that I've—one of the most *interesting* committees I've—well, there are two of 'em actually, that I was on at the University of Arkansas. One was a committee set up to study methods whereby the College of Business, the College of Agriculture, the College of Arts and Science (social sciences essentially) could cooperate on rural development problems, University of Arkansas. Never sanctioned by the president or anybody else. It was one of the better committees I ever worked on. Another one on urban problems that I sat on at the same University—it never had—well, I guess it finally got a college sanction, because it resisted some pressure to create an urban studies committee and this one already existed. So the arts and science members were created as an Arts and Science College committee. It actually created its recognition and the members did not seek recognition. Here, the pressure is always to create a committee to do thus and so, rather than simply people, you know, doing whatever it is they want to do without any formal sanction of

the committee. Maybe, I'd say, well, this is on their resume, or their merit recommendation, whatever; I'm not sure.

As far as campus politics are concerned, I really have tried to stay out of campus politics, in the sense of sitting back and seeing how they came out. There's different kinds of politics. Politics as policy making, certainly I haven't stayed out of that. I have tried to influence policies that are made, and in a number of different ways, too. Sometimes it's a question of when and where you express your views and let your views be known. Sometimes it's important to do that quite early on when the matter is being deliberated; sometimes it's better to wait until a position is crystallized and then challenge that position. It depends upon, really, the issues involved. I certainly have gotten involved in some situations as soon as I knew that something was happening and got involved in it at a very early level and even through individuals on committees, for example, to make sure that a viewpoint that I subscribe to got introduced into the discussion very early on. Others I've intentionally waited—laid back and waited to see what came out and then expressed my viewpoint. It depends upon—it's a question of strategy and tactics always, in terms of trying to—I wouldn't say *get my way*, but at least to have that way or viewpoint reflected somewhere in the process.

I think in the Business college, for example, getting away from the Faculty Senate *per se*, but into more general matters, I think the way I intervened in the Business college, the problems they had were—well, I'm rather pleased about the results. Some were intended on my part, some of 'em were unintended but quite welcome. Even those, I think, were natural outgrowths of things that I tried to start. You know, Hughs was my first choice for the deanship over there

and he turned out to be the faculty's first choice as well. I didn't try to influence that decision. That's the kinda decision you really can't try to influence. I didn't try to influence except by having certain types of people on the committees. You know, the Business school is rather strongly split against itself, and academically I side pretty much with one part of that group. And while I think the committee was broadly representative, I think the most effective people on the committee were people whose views I respect (and these are academic views I'm talking about), and who I think really want to develop the school and make it better than it is now. And when I'm choosing committees to deal with things like that, I usually try to make sure we have people like that on them, you know. The president can't do very much, but one of the more important things he *can* do is to choose persons who ought to be involved in the choice of personnel.

One of the more humorous incidents that I've had happen since I've been here, I guess, was the selection of the Arts and Science search committee. Of course, the Arts and Science college is the most activist—is the home of most of the activists on campus, and here I would include the NSP members. You know, just the campus activists. They had a meeting to discuss the guidelines. They essentially took the President out of the selection process on choosing the search committee, and they were adamant that, you know, I would accept the people on the search committee that they chose. And I agreed as far as the College of Arts and Science itself was concerned, I finally said, "All right." I had other protections. I did not accept the notion that I would accept only three recommendations. I insisted upon at least five nominees for the position finally, and I also claimed the right to name at least two outside

members, one representing other academic deans and one representing other faculty. I chose Bob McKee for one of those and Dean Nellor for the other.

Anyway, after they had the election, it was obvious that a slate had been arranged, but it was a slate not arranged by the activists on campus. It was more that group that's opposed to foreign language requirements and this sort of thing that got the slate together. I think, not a bad slate. The people, Eleanore Bushnell, I think, is beyond reproach as a member. Bob Tompson is a, I think, a very effective member of the committee of that sort. The unusual member, I suppose, was Al Lemberes. We're probably the only College of Arts and Science in the country—land grant school—that's ever had a PMS on the search committee for a dean of Arts and Sciences. Dick Burkhart, you know, undoubtedly a very fine person; Art Broten, I don't know Art that well, but he seems to have pretty good values. Anyway, the committee wasn't bad, as a committee, but it didn't satisfy the activists in the College of Arts and Science. So at the next meeting after the election results were known, there was a very strong pitch. In fact, I believe the motion may have carried—I don't recall for sure—to appeal to the President to name at least one member from the humanities which I took as sort of a tacit admission that they felt I could have done better to have pointed a committee [laughs], that they'da had a committee more to their liking if I'd've just appointed it myself. [Laughing] That was, I thought, a very, very humorous little incident that occurred in that connection.

The NSP members were very, very interested in what that committee did. The activists were, and as I said there's some correspondence between the activists and the NSP membership. There's still some flap on that, by the way. I guess we have another

section here somewhere about the selection of academic deans or something like that, but we'll go ahead and talk about it already—did I talk about the selection of Becky [Stafford]?

We interviewed too many people. I authorized finally the interview of nine candidates for that job. I think a part of the reason that they wanted to interview so many was a man named Anderson from Clarkson College was the ninth member. And they wanted to drop down and pick him up; he'd been interviewed before [for] the Graduate dean's job and turned down, although he was second on the list—something like that. I thought it was way too many; we could have had seven, but only bring in four outsiders. And our budget indicated that we oughta do it that way. But I chose not to argue with the committee on the point.

Some really *strange* people [were] brought in, you know. People that I resent even being able to put on their resumes that they were *interviewed* for the deanship of Arts and Science of University of Nevada, Reno. People that were just *totally* (not just to me, but to everybody almost)—almost anyone would get maybe one vote somewhere, but at least three of the candidates were just *bad*. You know, they shouldn't have made it here at all. Anderson, himself, did not wear (as far as I was concerned)—didn't come off as well on this interview as he did on the first one, for the Graduate dean. I would not think of offering the job to Anderson, although I think he was the committee's second, third choice.

In the selection process, and in part recognizing that the activist group didn't fully trust the committee, I arranged in the interview process to have the candidates interviewed by, of course, the committee, but to supply input to the committee, I also suggested to have them interviewed by the members of the Graduate Council from

the College of Arts and Science and in the same interview, the members of the Faculty Senate from the College of Arts and Science. And that group would then have input to this committee and also send me a copy of its recommendation. Also, [I] arranged then to have the department chairmen interview each of the candidates and the chairmen—I'm just making the assumption they are kind of a leadership group within the college, and once again the chairmen can make their input to the committee and also directly—with me getting a copy.

I think that the committee was not strongly influenced by the recommendations of those two groups, but they certainly heard their recommendations and considered them. And also, I had, oh, any of the Academic Council members that—I arranged for the Academic Council to meet with them. In part, too, of course—all other colleges depend in some part on the College of Arts and Science and I wanted to have the other deans feel like they had some role in making the selection. There's almost more of a political thing than it was anything else, but in any event, I invited all the deans and directors—the Academic Council basically—to meet with the candidate. We set aside an hour where the ones that could, the cocktail party, and the day—they were invited there as well.

Anyway, in the final ranking—kind of a strange set of rankings—it really wasn't a consensus choice, but Kinsinger from Michigan State was the number one choice of the committee, strongly number one choice of the chairman. I guess he was just barely the number one choice of the other group that we had looking at him. He was not the number one choice of many of the Academic Council members. I guess I thought very highly of Kinsinger, although I had an uneasy feeling about how well he would do getting along

with people. And that grew out of things he said talking about his chairmanship of the department of chemistry at Michigan State which is a very large department. And I felt like he might have some troubles in that particular college. Some other college, maybe not, but in that college with a little bit of authoritarian management style. His basic educational values I found myself in agreement with, and I didn't with quite a few of the candidates. I found myself way, way apart from many—some of the ones that I felt were just, well, three, those three that I felt totally unacceptable, at least part of, not all, but part of my objection was based on educational philosophy.

Anyway, when the recommendations came forward, I shared 'em with Bob Gorrell and asked him for a recommendation. And I pretty well shared with him all the information that I had from the committees and so on, and at the same time I was agonizing too. And I guess that Bob and I overnight, both of us, and not for entirely the same reasons, but very close, decided that Becky was our first choice over Kinsinger, and really, it almost had to, you know—Kinsinger was first, Becky was a very close second. Then it dropped down quite a bit to Anderson and Grotegut, and they were almost tied. Then it dropped down to—what was the fifth man's name? Anton, a man from Georgia. And so really it had to be—I felt that it really almost had to be either Becky or Kinsinger.

But also I think that generally I tend to favor an insider over an outsider in a close contest like that. And for one thing, the insider has made a more basic commitment to the institution, I think; they came here in some other capacity, and chose to become an applicant for a deanship. The other person has come here to *be* a dean, you know, and would not have come here otherwise. So I

think that, on any number of grounds, there's reason to, in a close contest, to favor the insider over the outsider. I was probably affected in some part, at least in a negative sense, by the fact that Becky was a woman, and our affirmative action obligations. At least, that certainly would have negated any inclination I might have had to drop down below Becky. While I never really considered *doing* that seriously, I think I would have felt that, you know, dropping down below her to pick one of the others would be— and I'da had to drop down to Grotegut, because I think I would not have chosen Anderson. Grotegut would have been my next choice on the list, I think. And it would have been very hard to justify, I think, dropping that far down the list to pick a person who turned out to be *male* in view of the affirmative action.

Besides the fact that I was impressed with Becky's interviews, I'd been involved with her in various ways, in different activities since I've been here, but did not know her that well, still. And I was impressed. She'd done a very good job preparing. She'd obviously done a good job researching *me*, knowing what my values were. Some of the things she said to me, you know, I kiddingly told Bob, seemed very close to being paraphrases of things I'd said two weeks earlier. [Laughs] But you know, that may be bad; it may not be. If that's what happened, it at least shows some intelligence, and I think that's what we look for in a deanship—at least in part, not totally, but in *part*. I think her values are reasonably sound as far as I can—the ones she expressed obviously *were*. Insofar as I could penetrate what her true values were, I think, I still found those to be sound. She obviously had done a very good job of knowing what sort of thing she ought to say when she had the interview with me.

The one thing we didn't do with Becky and also with Gene Grotegut, Bob and I were

able to be here together throughout every interview except—and we interviewed them together— except for Gene and Becky. And our travel schedules didn't mesh for those two, and so we had to break those two up.

Anyway, when I took the nomination forward, the word simply had not got out on who I was going to nominate. Well, at this level they require Regents approval. Anyone that reports to me requires the approval of the Board of Regents, so I really make a recommendation—I only make *one* recommendation. I don't give 'em a list and say this is my three or four; I take forward only one name. It would be a mistake to do anything else, *ever*. They either have to accept that one or reject it. They don't have any other choice at that point in time. If they reject that, we come back with somebody else, but they would not know who the person I'd be coming back with was. You know, at the Regents meeting the word got out and I fear it must have been through me. I must have mentioned it to someone who I was going to recommend. [If] one of the Regents had asked, I would've said, but I wouldn't have told anybody else, but I would have told them. I guess I told Chancellor Humphrey. Anyway, three of the Regents approached me. One particularly approached me, Fred Anderson, saying that it would simply be a terrible mistake to nominate Becky Stafford for that job, and he managed to enlist two others. Tom Ross, rather enthusiastically, Louis Lombardi, not very enthusiastically, to try to dissuade me from making the nomination.

I said, "Look, this is it. This is the nominee. I can't nominate anybody else; I don't *choose* to nominate anybody else." And anyway, when the question came up nobody voted against her. She was approved unanimously, but some of the votes were not audible.

What was their reason for trying to talk you out of this?

They didn't really say. Later on there was some speculation. I talked to the Chancellor about it, after the fact, and his speculation on it was that at that point in time they may have thought that Bob McQueen was still on the list. Bob was among the nine finalists, Of course, he was not one of the five nominees of the committee's sent forward, but I think that there was a strong favoritism toward Bob. That was Neil's suggestion—that he felt it was not so much being opposed to Becky as it was that they really would have preferred one of the other candidates who did not make that final list. No one has ever mentioned it to me from the Regents, although there's been some negative reaction on campus that I'm not directly aware of, but I'm still aware of it.

And I think at least—two sorts—I think a large part of it is just plain old male chauvinism by some of the department chairmen that just can't see themselves working for a female dean. I'm not gonna name names, but I think there is some element of that in the reaction. The other reaction is that, you know, it quickly got out that Kinsinger was not the first choice, and people felt that I was usurping faculty authority by naming someone who's not the first on the list, and I never got a chance to really respond to that. No one's ever asked me. But clearly the reason why I asked for five nominees was so that I could take my choice of any one of the five, not so I could run through the list and see if they'll accept or not.

There's just some confusion there about the role of the President in making appointments. I don't know where it comes from, but it's certainly some misinformation. And I'm sure that that's a part of it, that I was usurping the faculty prerogatives. I'd love to have a chance to set the record straight on that if somebody

just raised the issue, but so far it has not been raised. The most direct bit of feedback I've had on that did come from Chancellor Humphrey, where someone'd actually talked to *him*—someone from the faculty has come to see him to raise the objection. He refused to comment, so he said, so he told me, and told the person that had a question or objection they should come and see me. The person had asked to remain anonymous, and he said, "Well, if you go and see President Milam I'll let you remain anonymous; if you don't, then I won't." The person, whoever it was, has not come to see me and, as yet, I haven't heard who it was. But, you know—.

The very next item down here [on prepared outline] is the Academic Council, and the first one under that is the discussion of recruitment of deans and administrators—hmmm, so we've gone through one of those.

The Business one—we'll go ahead and talk about that a little bit. I didn't realize how serious the problems were in the College of Business and after I became aware that they were serious, I kicked myself. I even said before that—you know, that it seems strange to me and it's just a passing sort of idea, that I had got so little acquainted with the College of Business and its faculty because in places I'd been in the past, I've had closer relationships probably with that school than any other, except possibly in some areas of Ag. I've worked closely with Ag schools in the past, but usually more so with the College of Business. I have a strong interest in economics and every place I've been, economics has been taught in the College of Business. That's provided the relationship. I've had a very strong interest in business as such, and of course, the field I've taught primarily over the last several years has been administration—public administration, but a very close tie-in

with business administration. But really, I had no contact with this school, and I learned after I'd been here for a year, a little over a year, that I should have had a lot more contact than I had because there obviously were many problems over there. And if I'd become more involved, I think if I'd moved a little earlier, I might could have solved some of them. I would not have appointed [Bob] Weems for a post-retirement appointment, for example. Bob had sort of quit trying to provide leadership for the school, I think. That may be an unfair assessment, but that, frankly, *is* my assessment. He became interested in retirement and the problems associated with retirement, and just sort of let the school go.

We were a year late in finding a dean. At the same time I really felt like I *couldn't've* appointed—I would have had to appoint an acting dean. I don't like acting deans, basically. But then again, I really felt that the college needed to study itself and find out where it was going, what it wanted to do, what it wanted to be. There was far from being any consensus and I don't think there's consensus *now*, really. But at least the issues've been laid out on the table and everyone's had a chance to talk about them, respond to them. They have charted a direction, you know, and they hired a dean to take 'em that way. So, if there are dissidents (and there are), they at least know what the—you know, the report produced by the study group has got official sanction, has *had* official sanction, and the dean has been hired on the basis of that study report.

Also, I use that as a device to get some—a bit closer interaction with people downtown, in that college. We had a helluva time tryin' to set up that committee, and I finally had the idea of how to structure it. I did want the faculty to stay the dominant element. People should not be coming and telling the faculty directly what they oughta do. So the decisions had to

be basically faculty decisions, yet I wanted to keep the committee rather small, but yet involve a lot of other people. So we [had] in essence a series of interlocking committees, with a central committee composed of faculty, and then, for example, we had a supporting businessman's committee. The chairman of the businessman's committee was also a member of the central committee, but there were about seven or eight—six or seven—other businessmen on that committee. We had a committee composed of alumni, which also turned out to be essentially a business committee, although some members of that committee were not so highly placed in business as were the members of the regular business committee. There again, the chairman of the alumni committee only was on the central committee. And the idea was that the alumni committee would develop ideas, feed them into the main committee through the chairman. Then any ideas that were developed in the central committee would be fed back into the alumni committee through the chairman. And I think it worked out pretty well. Had a student committee set up the same way. I guess those are the only three. Then we used the same—that central then became very large, too large for a search committee. But because of the continuity we developed and because I was pleased with the result of the study report, quite frankly—it came out where I wanted 'em to—I used that same committee then with the consent of the college. I went to one of their meetings and expressed my intent to see if they had any negative reaction. [They] didn't express any, which doesn't prove anything [smiles], but at least none was expressed, to go ahead and appoint that same group to be the search committee.

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS

I had difficulty relating to Jim Anderson from almost the day I walked on campus, and I don't understand it, except that Jim and I don't work the same way. We don't approach problems anything at all the same way. I used to try to convince myself that we could be complementary in our approach, but it didn't work out that way. And I always liked Jim—I do like Jim very much and he tries a *thousand* percent to do what people want him to do, just a *thousand* percent effort all the time. I guess I felt, within a month after I was here, that over time, assuming I remained President, that Jim would not work out as academic vice president. And I waited and tried very hard to work it out and it just never did.

Jim is the most eager person to please I've ever met in my life, who worked harder at trying to please someone he worked for, and missed the target by as far as he did. I mean someone that tried as hard, to miss the target by that far. Jim and I are just personally incompatible. Jim's the type of administrator that has to be—if he can't find a rule to make

a decision, he has to make up a rule to make the decision; and then of course, that rule becomes the main problem the next time, you know. His solution'd become part of future problems. I just can't work that way. I'm not that much of a rule-oriented person.

Well, [I] could spend a lot of time citing chapters and verses where we're still working around rules that Jim invented to solve unique, really unique problems, you know. But there's got to be a rule, you know. You know, he was consuming—and I did do his job and my job both for some period of time; and I think that I actually had an easier time of it, doing both of them myself. And I was killing myself doing it. But I would have preferred that, I think, over the long haul.

He would bring materials up and sit and *read to me*, which I find exasperating. It's a personality trait of mine; I can read quite well, and read much faster than somebody can read orally to me. I never felt comfortable in delegating—in turning—you know, an administrator should have an area of responsibility where he is virtually

autonomous; and I never felt comfortable letting Jim be autonomous in any area.

Of course, he was the academic vice president, and the academic vice president is the most important officer in the University—I mean, our *mission* is academics. Student affairs, all the other areas of responsibility essentially support the academic area; and obviously, the academic area is the one in which I was most interested, so it's the one I would be least inclined to delegate totally. On the other hand, with Bob Gorrell, I find myself, you know, doing whatever he—you know, he *has* it—.

Essentially, people have to fight me for work. They take work away from me as it were, you know. If it's not done I'll do it, or try to. There's a lot on my desk [gestures] that I haven't done, obviously, but essentially I won't turn loose unless someone takes it away from me. And I like administrators that do that way. On the other hand, a person who takes off and—it's important that an administrator know when a decision they make affects somebody beyond the bounds of their bailiwick.

Bob Gorrell, I related to very quickly. I'd been impressed with Bob when I first came out here. Of course, I was accused of "old crony-ism" when I chose him for the academic vice president. I'd never met Bob before I arrived on campus, though. But I did relate well to him or—I'm still quite impressed by him. We don't agree on everything, but we agree on a lot of things. I think, in the case of Bob Gorrell, we're quite different types, but we are complementary, I think.

No question that Bob and I, so far, work extremely well together; I think even better than I anticipated, and we'll come back to that appointment at a later time. That's an event complete and entire within itself.

I do believe very strongly in professional education, for example. I think that it's a very important part of the University's function. I'd like to see it made better, and to my fundamental—I guess, my fundamental conviction is that that means that you have to have a better relationship between professional schools and College of Arts and Science. And that's got to be done in a way the College of Arts and Science does not dictate to the professional schools, and at the same time, the programs in College of Arts and Science maintain some integrity. One of the questions I've asked—we are now [February 11, 1977] engaged in the search for the dean of Arts and Science—and every candidate I've asked that question to, "How do you reach that accommodation between the needs of the College of Arts and Science and the needs of the professional schools?"

I think we've gone too far here in letting the professional schools—some do almost *all* their educating within their own borders. I was very disturbed, for example, when the ECPD was here examining the engineering programs, and they felt that one of the programs (mining engineering) did not have enough humanities content. That means humanities and social science courses to someone in the arts and science area. And they finally decided that while it didn't they would let it squeak by because the Arts and Science College had accepted two mining engineering courses as social science courses. Therefore, as long as the engineering students took one of those two courses, they would satisfy the minimum number the ECPD requires. That bothers me, you know. It really does. It rankles far beyond the point that it should, I think.

The first dean I hired, of course, was Dean Brand, in Nursing. And I interviewed her in Little Rock before I moved out here myself.

She was the only one that I interviewed; she was the committee's top choice, and we flew her from Michigan down to Little Rock. I spent four or five hours on Friday evening with her and then all of Saturday morning, finally had lunch with her out at the house. [I] was quite pleased—seemed excellent, an excellent choice, and we made her the offer and she accepted it. I've been pleased with her since I've been here too.

She also doesn't look very deanly.

No, not really, but she's done a good job and a nursing school is a tough school to be dean of. Oh boy, it's got more factions that a—hmmh! for a small school—. Now, maybe it has so many factions because it is a small school. I don't know. But it is a tough one, and the professional nurses, all the faculty have connections outside the school (almost all of them), and the professional nurses have a strong influence. They feel very possessive toward the school. I think she's done a good job of keeping those people at arm's length, yet keeping them interested in the school and pretty much charting her own course. By her own course, obviously, she has a very democratic *appearing*, at least, *modus operandi* in administering the school. So, I assume that her course is one that she's at least been able to sell to her faculty.

It's hard to separate early observations of administrators from later ones. Our deans vary a great deal. We'll get into specifics later on. Some deans, the dean's office is a pass through. Every problem that emerges in the department is simply cleared to the dean's office on its way somewhere else, looking for a solution.

Other deans, and Dale Bohmont, I guess, is the prototype here. Dale Bohmont assumes

that every decision he makes affects only the College of Agriculture. [Laughs] That's a problem in itself, you know. He's constantly doing things that get us in all kinds of trouble, all the way from lobbying with the legislature for his particular programs, at sometimes the expense of the University's budget, to rechanneling the Truckee River out on the S-Bar-S and not recognizing the effect it might have on the Indians and the fisheries, and so on, and getting us stuck with a two million dollar lawsuit (which we'll win I think, but it was hairy for a while), and so on down the line. But you know, if I had to pick between a Dale Bohmont and a dean that simply is a pass-through, I'll take Dale Bohmont every time. I'd much rather live with the headaches that Dale Bohmont gives me, as the headaches of a different type of dean. I'll be more specific.

You know, if I could brag just a bit, I think that the thing that a president can do is recruit good personnel to help him. And I, generally, am very pleased with the personnel we've recruited since I've been here. There are very few— at this point in time, there are very few positions where we've had changes, turnover (I'm talkin' 'bout the administrative posts) that I'm not pleased with the result. We've had a high degree of consensus, you know, throughout the search processes we've had. I haven't really *hired* anyone directly. I've had search committees involved in *every* appointment that I've made, and we have yet to really disagree vehemently.

But, that's been a very happy circumstance and Vera Brand, I think, started off a good tradition there. I'm still quite pleased with the job she's done. Once again, she's a dean that is very sensitive to the problems that she can deal with at the dean's level, and has a knack for, at least informing us of those things that are gonna have repercussions. They may be something she can deal with, but would have

repercussions outside the School of Nursing, or to bring to us those decisions that affect something more than just the School of Nursing.

I recall when they had more—they have a cut-off point of 2.5 [GPA] for admission to junior class under the revised curriculum. She was instrumental in revising that curriculum (making it a junior-senior program instead of a four-year program—the clinical part of the program), and they had many more students that cleared the 2.5 cut-off than they had spaces for in the clinical years. And they were trying to devise some type of a system for choosing the people that they would admit to the program. And while I respect what their intentions were (I think they were good intentions), they were leading us down the road to all kinds of lawsuits, using information that could not be objectified in any way whatever, to choose this person over that person.

We finally came back, by the way, to strictly a grade point cut-off. That's what they finally settled on when they realized what their problems were with their own proposal. The point is, that I make is, that they worked this out inside the college. Vera recognized that this is something that should be checked somewhere else before she went ahead with it.

Education, they'd probably've just brought me the problem, you know, and say, "What'll we do? We've got five hundred people that want to do student teaching, we've only got places for three hundred. How do we choose? Well, what'll we do?" They wouldn't even suggest *choosing*. In Nursing at least, they worked out a solution, but they recognized that it might have some problems, they brought it to us.

We were able to respond and get it changed (modified) to where it would hold up under attack, and I mean, legal attack.

These days everybody wants to go to court, so we have to think about those things. One of the problems that—we're talking about administrators and assignments and reassignments—one of the problems that Jim Anderson had, is that the vice president's office had gone through several permutations—the academic vice president's office—had gone through several permutations over the years. It'd been an executive vice president, it'd been an administrative vice president, and it'd been an academic vice president. Under each one of these changes, certain—it's been almost a provost at one time, I suppose. Under each regime (each criteria), certain functions accreted to the office; they never got rid of any of them, and you know, it was just a mess (organizationally speaking), far more than an academic vice president, as I conceive the job. It really was a provost job. I didn't want a provost, you know.

I have, effectively, reorganized the office, or the structure of the University, I think, more than a lot of people may realize. You know, before, everything except Athletics, Information-News Service, Business (that would include the Controller's office and Physical Plant) and Student Services (and I mean a very narrow Students—Dean Barnes, the things that report to her); everything else is under the vice president's office. That has been changed rather drastically since I came.

The reason why you organize a certain way is really to decide where you want disputes, or discussions held. At what level do you want disputes resolved? In areas that required a great deal of innovation, like of f-campus—well, it used to be GUE, for example (where you really expect a high degree of innovation) to have that reporting to a man who's essentially rule-oriented—I mean, you can see the contradiction that you have.

Admissions, of course, Admissions and Registrar is in the same office—that probably will be a problem that we’ll— it *is* a problem that we’ll address sometime in the future, I think. In this case, Jack Shirley is equally, you know—a registrar should be rule-oriented. You know, their job is not to make policy, it’s to enforce policy made by the faculty, basically.

Admissions, I think, calls for somewhat more innovation than registrar’s functions do. But in that case, you had a highly rule-oriented person being a supervisor and reporting to a highly rule-oriented person; and I think Anderson’s program reflects that. So does the Registrar’s office reflect that. We still have rules that serve no useful purpose other than just the need to have a rule, in the Registrar’s office. I’m surprised the faculty hasn’t revolted many years ago to what the faculty can and cannot do vis-a-vis the Registrar’s office. And usually it traces back to a rule which the faculty has made, and Jack is simply enforcing a faculty—say a Faculty Senate rule, or a Faculty Senate rule proposal. But I think, frequently, those rules have been adopted because Jack encouraged their adoption. Jack’s a very strong-willed person. He’s a very effective, highly competent administrator, no question about that. I think we need some new life in the admissions program, we’re gonna get it.

Anyway, we broke out areas like—well, the first thing—I felt like I needed some kind of professional assistance when I first came here, and I had Dick Dankworth made assistant to the President. I chose Dick for a very simple reason. He’s the only guy I found that wasn’t very busy in the wintertime. I had no money that year, you know; I came here with about a two hundred thousand-dollar deficit and I came here in August (one month into the fiscal year), and I still had a two hundred

thousand-dollar deficit, at *least*. That’s before the utility rates started skyrocketing that year. It got worse. And, I felt like I had to have some help. The regular staff really couldn’t give it to me. You bear in mind now, we only had just a very few people. Jim Anderson reported directly to me. It was very difficult to dip beneath him and pick up, say, a Jack Shirley, who was busy already anyway. But Dick Dankworth was director of Summer Session, only that winter he wasn’t very busy and I could see that.

And so I hit on Dick for the very simple reason he seemed to be a fairly alert individual who had some time on his hands, or what seemed to be time on his hands. So, I picked Dick to be my administrative assistant to the President on a part-time basis—someone that I felt I could give—. I already recognized that Dick was a fairly innovative individual. I had seen his summer school programs; I think he’s put together a fairly attractive—and [he is] sometimes probably even *too* innovative in the things he tackles. But at least he’s always *trying* to do something. And I wanted someone that I could give a problem to, define the parameters, and hope for a solution to come back, and did not have any line responsibilities. And Dick functioned *reasonably* well on the job; and there is a limit, *reasonably* well. And mainly because he didn’t respect the parameters too well.

Anyway, I think I found in Dick a resource which the University had not been utilizing very effectively, and of course, the upshot of that was in the reorganization of GUE, which was, you know, stuck on dead center. It was really in bad, bad shape. Once again, Grace Donehower, who was acting dean of the GUE is very heavily rule-oriented, and there you had that reinforcement. This is my assessment of the individuals anyway, of—where in that case, it became almost total inaction. Nothing

got done. That's an exaggeration, but nothing that was new, creative, that sort of thing.

Anyway, I decided to—there's a lot of similarity between the GUE and Summer Session. I actually found in my files there had been a proposal to do that sometime before I came here, several years before. It kind of dropped by the wayside, but I think in an earlier vacancy of the deanship, they talked about pulling together certain programs. I don't know what the terms of the merger were. Anyway, I decided that the thing to do would be to merge GUE and Summer Session and try—I also want to get GUE a presence on campus—that was off—and we don't have any space on campus.

So, Dankworth becoming director of that—I'm opposed to the term "dean" being used for, what I consider nonacademic-type responsibilities; *dean* is an academic title. We still have only a director of what is now EPCE (Extended Programs and Continuing Education—we fought over that name for three months). But I think Dick was of a resource that—and I understand that, you know, I understand at least part of why the faculty doesn't really trust him. It involves the feelings that they are not paid enough for their summer duties, although I think they're paid more than most anyplace else pays for summer teaching. It goes back to the fact that he's a former track coach. Coaches are not really acceptable, like a dean proper—a lot of things involved. Within the limits of what he can do, he does it extremely well. The job he's in now is really a service delivery-type function. He doesn't provide the service; he delivers the service. Somebody else provides it, whether it be an instructor, a college, whatever it might be. And he's very, very innovative in finding ways to get things done. We now have some classes being taught in Elko, Ely, approved by their respective colleges, where

nothing was being done. That was of course, a great price that this University paid, perhaps without knowing it, by cutting back on what it did, out around the state, everywhere except in the College of Agriculture.

Jack Shirley, we broke out and moved up to report directly to the President, and frankly, to encourage more contact with Jack where I could try to encourage him to be a little more flexible. It hasn't been as successful as I think the Dick Dankworth reassignment has been. (These are not in chronological order.)

I'd committed myself before I—you know, at the time I came out here—pretty well committed myself to the faculty. Faculty groups had asked me—. (I guess I'm saying this wrong.) I had made a personal commitment saying that when I was asked the question, that yes, I would prefer to have someone in an office of Institutional Studies and Budget.

One of the really humorous incidents (we thought it was humorous, anyway), the night that we had the dinner with all three candidates and the Regents, Marilyn and I were lying in our hotel room looking at some materials they had given us, and among these materials was some type of a budget document, and I noticed: "Prepared by K. Donald Jessup" (K. D. Jessup, maybe). And, "My that name looked familiar, sounds familiar. Where have we known someone with that name?" We thought, you know, "—Central State College in Oklahoma."

And sure enough, as it turned out, I asked the Chancellor that night where he'd hired Mr. Jessup, where he'd come from. He said, well, he'd hired him from the University of Nevada-Reno.

I said, "Well, where did he come from before there?"

He said, "He came from Oklahoma."

Anyway, we called Don the next day and talked with him (and that's immaterial). Later

on, when I began thinking about the office of Institutional Studies and Budget, obviously, Don knew that I was thinking about it. Don wanted to leave the Chancellor's office. Neil, I think, is a very hard man to work for. That's my impression. And he [Jessup] really applied for the job. We did not have a search for that job, and the reason we didn't was because we felt it was a lateral transfer within the University and therefore, a search was not needed.

We were creating a job we wanted to fill. We had someone that was doing that same job in a different place in the University. And so, we just moved him over laterally. As a matter of fact, Don already had tenure here on this campus. He was a campus obligation, as it were. If Neil ever decided to fire him, we'd have had to pick him up, I assume. It seemed a happy solution.

In all candor, I did not remember that much about Don from Central State College in Oklahoma. He was in the Registrar's office there; I was on the faculty teaching full time and doing a doctoral degree at the University of Oklahoma. We were friends, but, you know, just not that close. But, I had become acquainted with him since I was out here. I thought he did an excellent job of budget work in the Chancellor's office, not so much institutional studies. And that pattern has been true on campus, but it's mainly the press of budget work that's kept him from getting involved in such institutional studies work.

We still don't have a good budget process. It's a lot better than it was before Don came out. One day, you know, when Ron Ogilvie, under Ed Pine, was the so-called budget officer, and I'd been signing transfers based upon the fact that Ron had initialed them. And one day, I walked back and asked Ron what his initials meant; something caused me

to question it. He said, "What it means really is that I've seen it."

And I said, "Well, is that all you do?"

He said, "No, I check the figures to see if they're right—if they add up."

And obviously, that's when I really decided, I *had* to have a budget officer. That happened very early on, and that's when I decided I *had* to have a budget officer. It took a long time to actually get one even after that.

Ed Pine is a delightful person, works hard, easy to work with. Obviously, I recommended him to the Regents for an honorary degree here on the recommendation of the group that was advising me. I've forgotten who made the initial suggestion; one of the deans or vice presidents (or it may have been Jim Anderson that recommended—I think it was. But I wouldn't swear to it).

When Ed Pine is replaced (when he retires), we will not hire someone with his specialties in that job. The place badly needs to have a good, strong, knowledgeable financial person in that vice president's job. Ed's expertise is physical plant, and of course, we have Brian Whalen's expertise in physical plant and it's sort of a one-on-one reinforcement as far as our building and grounds are concerned, with almost no directive-type supervision for the Controller's office. And I simply don't have time—I'm doing more of that now, I think—don't have that kind of time though. And here I'm in no way knocking Ed Pine or the work he does; he does an excellent job, but in terms of what the office has to deal with, what the University as a whole has to deal with, we really ought to have somebody with a little bit different kinds of expertise than Ed has.

Ed is—you know, he *loves* the University in a platonic way; that is a tremendous asset. There's no way that I would ever consider—anybody even would suggest it, I guess, I'd

kick 'em out of the office. But the University as a whole suffers by not having a little different kind of expertise. You know, there's been an awful lot of change take place in what I would call institutional accounting over the last fifteen, twenty years—really the last ten years has really become important.

Our Controller's office here is oriented pretty much toward public fund accounting which is essentially fidelity accounting, making sure no one is stealing. As a management tool, our accounting is not very useful. That needs to be changed badly, and I think it will not be changed until we replace someone in that vice president's office. Henry Hattori's been here, God, I don't know how long, but a long, long time. Neil had that job, the vice president's job for a while, but then Neil's background is essentially public accounting, as much. You don't want too much creativity in accounting, as far as the way you balance the books and so on, but you want to get all the information out of the accounting office as you possibly can. I don't think we're doing that, so I—you know. If there's any one place that I see where great improvement is needed on campus, at this point in time (which I think we'll have to defer for some period of time), it's in the Controller's office, and not just there, but the organization of accounting generally.

The Chancellor now has a proposal to centralize all accounting in his office (the Controller's function in the System office). Obviously, I'll fight that as hard and as long as I can. That, essentially, would transfer the campus officer into a chancellor and make the Chancellor the president of the System (the chief executive officer of the System). You know, that just will not work as far as I'm concerned. But, you know, we have accounting scattered around the Medical school; we have it scattered over in the Agricultural school.

Presumably, Henry Hattori is the controller. He has no idea what the Ag school is doing. He had complete trust in Pete Test*—just accept whatever they did. And strictly speaking, Henry is not a controller as far as the Ag accounting is concerned, as far as the—not quite so extreme, as far as the Med school is concerned. [We] need someone like Fred Vorsanger, University of Arkansas, formerly with the ACE (American Council of Education), a real financial man, in that vice president's job eventually to really get it straightened out.

You don't need to know about the buildings and grounds from a technical sense in order to supervise it. I think you need—you wouldn't actually have to know that about the controller's office, but I think that our depth, shall we say, in building and grounds is much greater than our depth in the Controller's office. So the next person in that job needs to be a strong, strong, financial man, preferably from some kind of a private background—private business, that sort of background. Not totally, and the reason there is simply because you're more apt to get the kinds of innovation in reporting, I think, from someone who is familiar with the kinds of information that accounting can really provide, you know. And in the business sector there is a great deal more pressure to generate that kind of information.

The alternative, of course, would be waiting until Henry retires and then bringing in someone like that in the Controller's office. That would be a somewhat longer range prospect.

Incidentally, one of my notions when I brought (and this I certainly want to restrict)

*Retired accountant, College of Agriculture

—one of my notions when I brought Jessup out here was the idea that he might well work into that vice president's job. I no longer believe that's possible, but that was one of the—in fact, that's one of the reasons why the Chancellor agreed to the transfer. He wouldn't stand in the way of an upward mobility for Don, and the transfer of Don has been extremely costly to the Chancellor's office. He's not found an adequate replacement for Don.

On the observations of [other] administrators, we have some problems in what I would call the student service area, conceived generally. Jack Shirley is a very strong administrator, a very aggressive individual who obviously made his job a great deal more than the official title would normally convey.

Roberta [Barnes] is a terribly weak administrator—just a terribly weak administrator—a very good person, but has been unable totally (and this may go back to the thing you and I were talking about, about the latent hostility toward women in Nevada society)—she's been unable to really assert her role as Dean of Students. The student government for three successive administrations has simply refused to work with her; and that's in part, they're a president, they want to work with a president. But that's not all of it either. There's something more than that. And it—she's just not forceful. Her own division is torn. Bob Kinney, of course, wanted very much to be Dean of Students and, I think she has never been able to assert her authority over Bob. She likes to blame this on the fact that in part, Bob has a direct responsibility to the President in his disciplinary role (the administrative officer, as far as the students are concerned), but that's an excuse not the reason.

By the same token, she tends to be—and Bob is a very forceful administrator, Bob

Kinney, in his own way. I don't like his way too much, but in his own way, he's a pretty good administrator. On the other hand, she tends to—the ones that do respect her authority don't always—she tends to favor those and they don't always deserve that kind of favor.

One of the first flaps we really had on campus during my tenure, the dormitory flap, we had to do something. And one of the steps we took was to—the housing function was split; the responsibility for the programs were under Roberta, and for financing and maintenance and so on, under Ed Pine. We merged those under Roberta which was the only place they could have been merged (being merged), and she acquired Shirley Morgan. And I think Ed had some blind—Shirley is not effective, you know. Things don't get done. Shirley rankles over the fact she's a classified employee—perhaps should not be, but it is very difficult to move out of one service into the other here in the University. You know, the great hope was that when Roberta finished her doctorate, got her promotion to Rank IV, that her confidence would increase, and it really hasn't. There's been no real significant change that I can see. She's very nice to work with. She's very pleasant to work with. But there's a lack of assertiveness that really is needed by someone in that role.

You know, I was impressed with Bob Weems. [He] is very impressive-appearing individual. I recommended him for a post-retirement appointment, and I think that was a mistake. I think that Bob was probably a very effective dean at some point in time, but his outside interests had pretty well taken over. Maybe the psychology of upcoming retirement had set in, and really he had over-delegated, I guess. Over-delegated in some ways, without really delegating anything at all, if that makes sense. He delegated the responsibility without the authority, I guess,

to two associate deans. If it had been one associate dean it might have worked out better.

I didn't realize the—after we had some problems develop in the College of Business, I wondered. In most schools where I've been, I've had very close relations with the schools of business and I was amazed at how ignorant I was—how few people I knew in that college even, at that point in time. I got pretty well acquainted pretty fast when they did develop some problems. Bickerings in the accounting department finally resulted in hiring a new chairman from outside. Accreditation problems that I certainly should have been aware of, that if they'd been called to my attention, had not been done so in a forceful enough fashion.

I think, you know, the post-retirement for Bob which he wanted very much was a mistake. He had retired psychologically, too much, at that point in time.

Tom Cargill chaired [the search committee for the dean of the College of Business Administration] and did an excellent job, I thought. I did not know Tom really before that and [I was] a little bit dubious about his being named—he seemed awfully quiet—and when I say I didn't know him, I'd met him and talked with him, but I hadn't really got to know him. And he seemed a little bit too quiet, certainly not aggressive enough to, you know, pull together the kind of strength that I had planned to be on the committee. [He] did an excellent job, though. I was much impressed with him.

That search finished quite a while before the Arts and Science search. They both were started about the same time. The actual search as the business committee studied it started eight months earlier before it began. It had to complete that first step before I'd let 'em begin the search. It turned up some pretty good

people. There was a local person who was not an insider. Dick Rottman was the number two choice on that committee. By the committee and also by me, I think. But there was a larger, much larger gap between the first choice and the second choice there than there was in the College of Arts and Science. And in all candor, I was predisposed. I was asked about insiders and outsiders early on, and I said, "There's a ninety-ten probability of having an outsider in the College of Business, probably a fifty-fifty or sixty-forty probability on an insider versus an outsider in the College of Arts and Science." I was predisposed towards an outsider in the College of Business, in part because I felt that if somebody in the college had really wanted to take it the direction I felt it oughta go, they should be being heard from and they weren't. I just didn't see the kinda leadership in the college that I felt it needed. The man we did finally hire, Dick Hughs, took a tremendous cut in salary to come here. He does not have the background that even the college itself specified in their original list. For example, his graduate training is all in mathematics and specified a Business Ph.D. of some sort, and mathematics certainly doesn't fit that bill.

Here again, I think we have some resentment in the college over the Hughs choice. It's certainly a very small minority at this point in time. Essentially, it's from the stand-patters, the people who like things the way they are and don't want them changed. These are people in accounting—the accounting department is in very bad shape. There are people in accounting that like to teach and spend most of their time filling out tax returns, who use the University as a base from which to moonlight, people who have simply not stayed up in their field. You know, the publication record shows that and there's no research interest—no research activity.

Dick Hughs has got a big problem. He really has. I think a much bigger problem than Becky* does, but I think he can get it done. He isn't—if you've seen him, you know— if I'da had any conception of what I thought a dean of Business would look like in appearance, Dick Hughs would not have been what I would have anticipated hiring. And both these people are quite young. Both these deans are forty. And that's pretty young for a dean it seems to me, kind of a changing of the guard.

Breese is still a curiosity to me. I don't really understand even at this point in time exactly what Chuck's interests, motivations and so on are. Engineering school is much stronger than the Mines school, but I wonder if it's not because Jim Anderson has been, for example, Academic Vice President. He was dean of that school. I don't know it for a fact. I never have bothered to go back and check. I don't see that kind of assertiveness in that respect, you know. I think Baker is a much more assertive dean than Breese.

I've heard rumors since I came here that Breese was about to retire, take an early retirement. He worked for the System for a long, long time. I've never asked him about that. But he's not a very strong dean, it seems to me. He's timid with regard to public service activities. (Baker is too, in some ways, a little timid about trying anything new.) Except that last year in recruiting a number of people in the electrical engineering department, did an excellent job I thought. So, you know, nothing is either wholly one way or another. When you say anything about an individual, to some extent, I guess by having said something, you suggest a greater bias in that direction than you actually have.

Baker's a good dean. I'm kinda surprised. I didn't think he would be when I first met him. He didn't strike me as being a dean type at all, but I think he's a rather effective dean.

He's recruited some good people; he has a good sense of public service. I haven't been able to come to grips with the coordination and, I guess, the reinforcement of the three different roles you have in the Mines school. They do have, as Ag does a fairly highly developed teaching, research, and public service. The research done in the bureau doesn't seem to be that good to justify the monies spent—kind of a low level-type research. Some of the mapping they do is pretty good. The public service role is a kind of retiring public service. I gather that some years past, there was some kind of a threat by the state to take over the public service function, and that apparently has a memory of that. And that tends to encourage 'em to kinda retreat into the background and do only what they're compelled to do, you know, or what they're forced to do. I think it should be a more aggressive-type public service, really.

Mining is a very important part of this state's economy and I think the university as a whole could get more mileage out of the School of Mines. Right now, the School of Mines is a financial liability to the University, and it should be a financial *asset* to the University; in other words, a program that would generate more money rather than one that would siphon off funds.

Where we have, you know, twenty and twenty-five to one faculty-student ratios in many departments, the Mines generally has about 8.5 or 9 to 1 ratio, and that's essentially what I mean, that's a net cost. And even there we need more. That needs to be lowered to cover areas of expertise, you know. We don't have the economies of scale in the School of Mines. We could handle a lot more students than we're able to handle now. The enrollment is too low to justify it.

*Dean of Arts and Science, Rebecca Stafford.

While we're still talking about this early period, did they discuss with you early the possibilities or the threat of merging the schools?

No, but it occurred to me very early on that, you know, one way to accomplish some, perhaps, some reinforcement of engineering programs (and these are high cost programs to us) would be to reduce our administrative cost; merge these and try to develop a broader based program. And it was quickly brought to my attention that this had been tried before and didn't work. I may try it again. If our budget this year is as poor as it looks like, that's certainly one of the possibilities we'll be looking at, is putting those two schools together. I don't think that the administrative field of the dean or the academic field of the dean is all that significant. If that were done I, undoubtedly, would try to merge them both for political reasons and for other reasons under the deanship of Baker.

It may well be, we'll have to, you know. There's no question we'll have to do something to economize this year if the budget comes in the way it looks like it will. And that's certainly one of the things that I'm discussing. I think you know, I really feel like the governor's budget's a disaster. This was a *key year* for the University. We *had* to have some support this year. I haven't given up totally, but I'm already trying to think of some ways that we can convert disaster to opportunity. I think you have to do that, you know. And if we can seize upon the "time of troubles" to accomplish some things that really should be done on their own merit—and the merger of those two schools is one that should be done. They're too small really to exist independently.

We have more schools than almost any university I know. Our administrative costs at the dean's level is really rather large. Otherwise, I

think the administrative costs here are—I think this is a very lean organization. Compared to most schools that I know, we have very few administrative personnel, you know, doing the work of administration. Our percentage of our total budget that's devoted to administration and general expense-type functions compares favorably with schools three times our size. And of course, in administration is an area where you do achieve economies of scale, in a sense of administration as a percentage of total cost.

So, with our enrollment, if we are running, you know, eight to ten percent in those areas, where other schools three times our size run eight and ten percent, you know, I think that's an economical management system. Any school has only one president and one academic vice president and so on down the list. Many of them have up to six and eight vice presidents, though, and of course, once you employ someone then they tend to generate work for themselves to prove that they're essential. I like lean administrations. I don't like administratively top-heavy organizations. And, you know, the pattern in the jobs that I've been in, the pattern has been to reduce administration. That has not been true here; we've actually, I guess, increased it somewhat, but very, very modestly. We have basically the same organizational structure we had when I came, as far as the different offices—I've shuffled 'em, you know, moved them into different reporting levels.

I think Tom O'Brien (and Tom is a very good friend of mine)—. I learned from your oral history the other day* that except for Tom I probably wouldn't have been considered for the job. Apparently, he came back from

*Annual Oral History for the University, 1974.

Arkansas (his trip to Arkansas) strongly convinced that I was the one, and that really is what got me in consideration for the job. But independently of that, Tom and I, I think, are very good friends. Here, again, I think Tom began to retire a long time before he actually retired. The last two years (two years I was here while he was here, I think), he was pretty much stepping out, in the sense of not fighting battles quite as assiduously as he had in earlier years. I know the history there, so I know that he fought some very, very tough battles. His problems with the College of Education, I think, are—they finally wore him down, maybe. You know, his sincere devotion to try to maintain quality in the graduate programs. At the same time, I think that Tom, in a sense, took too much upon himself personally there, and sometimes I felt that it'd become kind of a game between—rather than the College of Education taking any responsibility for quality, it became kind of a game between that college and Tom that, you know, whomever they get through was fine, you know, that they didn't have to worry about quality because Tom was gonna take care of that. It's just a contest between who could do what to whom, sort of.

I was warned when I came here that I'd be under all kinds of pressure to—there would be appeals over Tom's head to me to admit candidates that weren't qualified into graduate study. Tom Tucker did call on me one day and allow as how this had been done in the past and might be required in the future. That same day he had a couple that I refused to overrule Tom [O'Brien] on, and I never was asked to overrule him again. It wouldn't have happened, I don't think. Either Tom had actually softened a great deal, or else people that might have wanted him overruled felt like the chances of success weren't very great as indeed they would not have been.

[Patricia] Tripple is a problem. In fact, I suspect she will not be a dean much longer. She has an administrative style that doesn't—. I guess my analysis of the problem in Home Economics comes down to a generational gap, among other things. Her administrative style is probably typical of what home economics schools were twenty years ago, twenty-five years ago, but kind of a maternal attitude toward faculty, and the young women we have on the faculty now don't want maternalism, believe me. They want to be recognized as professionals and dealt with as professionals, hopefully on their own merits. They seem to say that, anyway. And Pat would do—you know, if you can give Pat a book of rules and say, here's what you do in this situation, she'll do her damndest to carry it out, you know, and do what you want done. It's just that she doesn't have the sense for what she *ought* to do without coming and asking someone in a situation. And when she does try to make her decisions by herself, they're invariably, invariably wrong.

In the climate, the University of Nevada-Reno, the use of anonymous letters of recommendation for promotion, this is something she seriously proposed, you know, and actually had it discussed at the Academic Council meeting one day. And all the other deans, including the ones in Engineering, were just horrified by the idea that someone would consider using anonymous letters of recommendation to which the faculty would not have access, you know. I could go on to other similar cases, but that, I think, typifies the problem.

I think with all the deans, you know, if I had to say that any one mythology that I think has damaged the programs of this University in the years before I came, and we haven't got it out of its system yet, it's what I would call the fulltime equated student mythology.

I recall when I was interviewed here, being asked questions about formulas and so on. And at the time I was mystified as to why I was being asked questions like that. Anyone uses formulas for decisional purposes, you know, but they use formulas to help them make decisions. They don't use formulas to *make decisions for them*. Somehow a myth had developed, whether based on practice (I don't think so)—I'd gone back and reviewed for the last six or seven years, whether we'd ever slavishly followed a formula system in funding departments on campus. I can find no evidence of that. You know, I think what happened was, that the formula approach was developed and used to essentially divide money among the various divisions at the University. That was the basis of the request to the governor and the legislature. And I think somehow, sort of a mythology developed that the same type of rules are gonna be applied to departments in colleges. I can find no evidence that they ever were in any kind of a slavish fashion.

You know, *programs* are basically what are important. But it's been awfully hard to wean the faculty and the deans away from the notion that there's something magic about a full-time equated student that's gonna produce money, if you just have enough of them. And I think that Pat's been one of the people who pursued this more than most of the deans, to the point of actually, I think, jeopardizing her own programs in order to attract more students. You know, you can always put on a course that—human sexuality or whatever it wants to be—is gonna attract a lot, lot of students. It has no real relationship to a program.

Scheduling courses in strange little bits and pieces, one- and two-hour segments in order, so that the students around campus can plug this into their schedule, you know.

Actually evaluating faculty in terms of how many students they were able to attract. Those are not administrative traits that I admire. I'll be honest about it. They're just not the kind of principles, I think, that ought to govern the administration of any academic program. Numbers are important only in the sense that there's a critical mass—you know, I'd love to see more students in the School of Mines, simply because we have resources there we can't utilize effectively. We haven't cut the programs back; on the contrary, we'll probably add people to that staff next year because of our accreditation problems. But the FTE mythology is a very strong and pervasive one. Also on the other hand—I said critical mass—there's a critical mass beyond which a given faculty cannot handle the students any longer, where you have to provide relief. But, you know, that doesn't occur in the simple gradations that we're talking about like seventeen FTE, seventeen to one ratio versus eighteen and a half to one ratio. That's not gonna affect anybody's funding and that's what we're talking about basically.

It's hard to convince people that what we really expect of them are good programs. And that's what they really are evaluated on, that's what we make our decisions on. You know, you can point to actual cases. I know I met with the Home Economics faculty at the request of Dean Tripple last year, and went through this and pointed out, we had awarded a new faculty member in the department of chemistry because that particular expertise was important to their program. And no way could they justify that on an FTE, you know; it's just not in our teaching loads, even.

And I was told after I left that Pat said, "Well, he talks that way here, but he talks otherwise elsewhere," [laughs] "and behaves otherwise." It just isn't so. There's no place where you can point to a decision made Since

I've been here. We haven't had any new faculty to allocate really. We've been able to squeeze out one or two, but nowhere has there been made anything other than programmatic considerations. And a part of the program consideration would be that the department has just so damn many students that they can't conduct their programs. But that, you know, that's when the critical mass gets very, very large when that happens.

You haven't talked about Dean Cain, except in connection with Tom O'Brien's problems.

Yeah, I think Ed is a—I understand in the past he was a very effective dean. He, of course, had a heart attack before I came here. He has a tough college to administer and part of the toughness, I think, comes from Tom Tucker, you know. There's no question about that. And I think that Tom Tucker's kind of worn Ed down over the years. Now lately, I've begun to see signs of—and I've been trying to encourage this—a reassertiveness on Ed's part, to get him to take a little more control over the college. If I had to single out one college where I would say that the dean's office has been, since I've been here, essentially a channel for communication without much happening at the dean's level, it would be Education.

I would say that the dean's office in Education has been the weakest dean's office in the University. And I have seen some indications that that's changing. I hope that's true. Ed's a good man, I think he did a good job here for a very critical time. He replaced a dean that was—everything that I've seen, heard or anything else about the man, you know, just not the kind of person that I'd want at all. I didn't know him, I never met him, and I think Ed was a pleasant breath of fresh air. Socially, we see the Cains as much as anyone

else. We like them very well. But he's not been a very effective dean. But I repeat, I see signs that that's changing. He's taking control, and that's what a dean has to do, you know. They have to be at least somewhere up near the top of the heap. But, you know, I fully recognize the problems that Ed as had with his own staff and the rather great amounts of pressure that brought to bear on him.

We've done some things that I think are hopeful. When I first came here, I suggested we ought to have, oh, some more formal ties with the school system. I suggested that it would be good to have some teachers on the accreditation committee, the committee that is involved with teachers' certification, really. It was not well received. The next year it came back to rue as a suggestion of Ed Cain, and of course, I was very pleased. That's the type of thing—I think he was somewhat threatened by having someone from the schools on that committee, and whereas a year and a half later he saw it as a strong advantage. I think we'll have that and, hopefully, stronger people.

I haven't convinced Ed yet as to the importance of research. I think that education (the field of education) is one of the places where, you know, whatever we're doing in the schools, it ain't right, it ain't workin', not as well as it should. I think anyone would concede this, and any place that's fertile for—a fertile field for research, it's education. And I see no reason why the University of Nevada-Reno shouldn't be doing its part in that process. If the problems for the educational system is because we're training bad teachers, let's train fewer of them and learn what's, you know—spend some time doing some research to find out how we can train better ones. We don't know.

I think we know so little about education in terms of what it takes to produce good teachers. We know so little about the

learning process. Most learning theory that's practiced—that's taught in education college—goes back to basic Skinnerian principles, I think, which are very good teaching mice to run mazes, but I think are very, very poor when it comes to teaching human beings. When we do break out from that pattern, when we turn over the teaching of mathematics to mathematicians and get a new math, that becomes a horrendous error in its own right. And I think that, you know, there were certain fairly well agreed upon principles of human behavior that should have kept us from, as a society, from going so wholesale toward the new math.

I guess I see that research in that school as being perhaps a guardian against falling victim to some of the fads that sweep through. I sometimes like to say that a university is a strange organization, because it's the only one I know that's filled with people who are dedicated to proving themselves wrong. By that I mean that I hope that all of us are involved in trying to discover new knowledge, and to demonstrate that what we're teaching as knowledge now is not any longer knowledge. (That's a lousy sentence, but maybe you can correct it when you have the transcription [laughing].)

I don't see that at all in the College of Education, you know. I don't see any real interest in discovering new knowledge about the educational process, and it's one we know so little about. I can't imagine myself working in a field where I—I think most educators (by that I mean people in education) agree with this that they're not sure of the principles that they base their teaching and so on, on. And I can't imagine myself working in a field where I was so unsure about what I was teaching without being just, you know, totally devoted to trying to find something better to teach than what I was teaching. But you know,

maybe I exaggerate the extent to which they are not sure about their principles.

Whatever else, I think that what the schools do certainly ought to cause some misgivings that what we're doing is not best. I just feel that way.

We still have two of our top administrators, one in the Medical school and one in the Library. The Medical school has certainly taken up enough of everybody's attention and a lot of complaints about resources. Dr. Smith has certainly given an interesting leadership there.

Hap [Morehouse], I think, is a good librarian. Let's talk about Hap first. He's a good librarian. He's a nice guy and likes to be a nice guy. And I think he solves his, you know, the administrative problems that anyone has, essentially by trading up. And usually it results in a greater expense—promotions, raises—. If it comes to two people who are similarly situated, where one probably merits promotion, the other one is doubtful, rather than to really confront the issue and make the discrimination that's required, under the circumstances, he recommends, "Promote both of them."

My one big flap with Hap occurred over the reorganization in the Library. I say a big flap; it wasn't all that big. He brought a reorganization to me, explained how it would improve the efficiency of the Library and so on, and I took his word for it. You know, I have no way to judge. Finally approved it. Within a month, I guess, he came in with a price tag of what it would cost to promote this person and that person and this person over here. You know, my concern was that this should have been all on the table from the outset. And even now with Hap, I still keep waiting for the other shoe to drop— [laughs] with everything he brings me. [Laughs] I think it's a good library;

he has a very loyal staff. I think it's a very dedicated staff. I've had some trouble—. Well, I've had some trouble getting the Library open as much as I think it should be open. To what extent that's because of limited resources, I don't know. Yet, I do know that we—well, we put resources in to keep it open, and somehow the hours keep gravitating downward, you know. The resources remain, but somehow the results don't stick.

Essentially, I think I've enjoyed a pretty good rapport with Hap. Hap may not agree. I've made some decisions, you know, like I took his bathroom away from him in the new library building. There was one just down the hall. On the whole, I think, he does a pretty good job. I'd like to see him a little bit more hardnosed. I don't mean be hateful or anything like that, just be a little bit more hardnosed and a little bit more confident of himself as the administrator, as the Director of the Libraries. I think it comes back to that, probably.

George Smith is obviously a promoter. He's had to be, or he wouldn't be in the job he's in. I still feel a little bit like I was sandbagged over the four-year Medical school, the conversion of the Medical school. I was kinda set up for it, I think. I'm not suggesting that George intended it that way, but from our standpoint, it came at least two to four years too soon. I think there's no question about that. It's very hard for me to evaluate, at least in the sense of challenging the pressures that George himself was feeling on behalf of the Med school students. Assuming that those pressures were accurate, I think that we were faced with the prospect of converting to a four-year school, or perhaps phasing out the one we have, or some other drastic change. I'm really not sure that the situation was quite as critical as it was painted. I didn't have any evidence that it wasn't, you know.

I will say that I thoroughly enjoyed the year that George was on sabbatical—leave rather; he was not given a sabbatical and Tom Scully was acting dean. I always knew where Tom was “at,” in the vernacular. I never know where George is. George almost left this year; at least I have every reason to think that he did. He was offered a very good job, much higher salary, in West Virginia. And I really thought that he was gonna take it, and I'm not sure I'da been sorry if he'da gone.

It's important that, you know, it's important that people—I think I have the fault probably of too much candor. I say too pointedly and point blank where I am on issues. With Tom, we had a—you know, I knew where he was, he knew where I was and that's a good relationship to have. Doesn't mean that he fights any less aggressively for his program, but I see him when he's fighting. You know, and I don't mind him banging my desk, that's what we hire deans for, I think. But I'd rather have him bang the desk out in front of me where I can see what they're doin'. Smith and Bohmont are much alike in that way. They play all the angles and sometimes, well, the end run is still very much a part of their repertoire. Anyway, it does embarrass the University, you know, from time to time.

I sometimes think that Dale Bohmont believes that the College of Agriculture *is* the University, and I'm convinced that George Smith thinks that the School of Medical Sciences *is* the University. I think it's very likely that, in time, there's a very good chance that the School of Medical Sciences is broken out as a separate entity entirely. It now, already is a separate budget category—a separate appropriation area and the funds are appropriated directly to the School of Medical Sciences and cannot be used in other areas. By the same token, money appropriated to other areas can't be used in the School of Medical

Sciences, so there's some advantage there. But I think, George chafes under the restrictions of being part of the University. He'd like to be associated with it, but not subservient to the uh—(George isn't subservient to anybody), but not under the authority of the President of the school.

I think in time, there will be an effort to break that out. At the same time, it is tied to the University by the Allied Health Programs in the School of Medical Sciences. We have to make a decision soon, I think, on what's gonna happen to the Allied Health Program. That's another area where they're fascinated by FTEs, and they're really developing another school of arts and sciences, I think, or what I would conceive is the proper function of a school of arts and sciences, over in the School of Medical Sciences.

I just finished filling out the Hay Associates form. And it asked me to in one area to list how I dealt with my subordinates, and I wrote back, "Hell, there ain't no way you can generalize that way. It depends upon which subordinate you're talking about." And you know, there is so much variation here. I guess there's kind of a general pattern that I could talk about, but when it comes down to details, there's no way you can generalize because they're different people entirely. I would never give Dankworth the kind of autonomy that I give to Ed Pine, for example; or either one of them the kind of independence that I give to Bob [Gorrell]. And curiously, Bob insists upon checking with me more than the others do, before he does something.

On the Academic Council—. I'm not happy with the Council. I haven't been since I've been here. And for the same reason I'm not happy with the Faculty Senate—a lack of concern with policy (University policy). Most of 'em don't even want policy articulated. They'd rather leave it vague and amorphous

so they wouldn't be held accountable. I guess that was expressed in my own case, most clearly, with my total dissatisfaction with the Academic Council as a course-approving agency. The courses they got approved, you know, should never have been approved, in my view. I let some of them go through. I stopped some of 'em. But if I hadn't stopped 'em they would have gone through, I think, without any question. It was a log-rolling type of system; it was a back-scratching type of system. It was rarely ever any serious concern with how course and curricular alterations would affect resource allocations. They simply weren't discussed. And I tried to change it inside the Council and got *nowhere*—didn't try very hard, really. It was obvious that I wasn't gonna get any kind of a change. A few occasions where I tried to pick some point that was raised and raise the level to a level where you'd be discussing policy, no success—a lot of moaning and groaning about oh, forms and all kinds of work that they had to do, for which they were being paid, I think, you know. But as a collectivity, it just didn't jell; it didn't really do what I think an academic council ought to do.

My dissatisfaction with the course and curricular changes, of course, led to the creation of the University curriculum committee, where I turned this over to a group of faculty. We're still experimenting there. I don't think we've found the total answer—and I have not met with that committee, Bob Gorrell has, every meeting I guess—but he still feels very positive about the prospects of this new committee, the faculty committee, which you know, has in its charge that it's supposed to raise questions about duplication of effort. They're supposed to raise all these and satisfy itself that those are in fact answered before something is approved. That was not an innovation on my part, you know.

The best course and curriculum group I've ever seen, in my own experience, University of Kentucky, on which I served, was a faculty committee. Deans came and made their pitch to the committee; the deans did not sit on the committee. And approval by the committee was a prerequisite to getting a course adopted. Once again, [there's] tremendous looseness in that area.

I was surprised this year. Although, you know, I think that the review by the Academic Council was not effective, at least during the year, every—if you changed a comma, it had to be approved by the Academic Council. And I learned this year that when it comes down to the catalog copy, deans go through and make *wholesale* changes in the catalog copy and never—without benefit of the Academic Council. They just push it through. And that was not being caught—just wholesale reorganization of programs without benefit of review by anybody, really. Just unheard of practices. But we have that stopped now, I think. At least the—yeah, I think we have it stopped. That's the only plan I have for the reorganization of the Council, really, and that's already been accomplished. The other alternative, I don't think is performing quite as well as I hoped it would, but I think it shows promise of getting in that area.

The minutes of the Academic Council look as if they must have the dullest meetings and the most log-rolling of any body on campus.

And no matter how short the agenda, it always expands to fill up the time between nine and twelve. That's the amount of time people allocate to the Academic Council, and they just can't break off any sooner than that. They're not effective meetings. You know, they don't really—they do serve some purpose. They're a place where they all get together,

informational, you can give information at those meetings and we do have usually a lot of announcements to make. But really no policy comes out of them, not really. Even when they approve a policy. You know, it's already been a policy change; it's a change that's already reached fruition somewhere else, and it's a rubber stamp, you know? I guess they may have blocked a few things since I've been here that'd reached that level, but I can't think of any right offhand, I really can't.

Can you do anything with them, besides the course and curriculum?

I think we're making progress. I think we're making progress. Well, we took that away, so that left them needing something to do. And we're trying to plug in a few discussions. You have to bring them along slowly, I think. We're trying to plug in a few policy type discussions and occasionally we have had some pretty good meetings. The Academic Council itself asked for, this year, and during the Christmas break, they asked for a couple of special meetings. It so happened that I was out of town and could not attend, but we agreed to two full-day meetings during the Christmas break. And I think that was a significant change, it seemed to me, where the day's agenda was filled—well, there were some nit-picking little problems, but they were real concerns from members of the Council, so that was legitimate, you know. But there were some policy issues that were discussed during those two days. So I think we're making changes there. I think the Council itself is changing. You know, given the Faculty Senate's concerns, it becomes more important, it seems to me, that there should be *somebody* on campus—by somebody I mean some collectivity with representation from most of the colleges discussing what it is we're

all about, what are we doing? What *should* we be doing? How should we be doing it?

You know, if the President were really a power-mad individual, just because there's a total vacuum there, he could just step in and just change everything he wanted to change. Just like the deans change their programs, by putting it in the -catalog, just because no one's watching and they should be watching. They should be concerned.

They do look out, of course, for things that affect their own bailiwick, and I think that's the real problem, that there's been a focus upon—an inward type of focus upon—"my program" and almost no effort to think about the total University. And you know, I think they have to think about "my program." But there's a big difference, it seems to me, between thinking of "my program" in the context of the University and in thinking of "my program" as something that's against—the rest of the University's against, or at least potentially against, you know. It's the old Charlie Wilson quip, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country," you know; you can turn that around, I think, and say, "What's good for the country is probably goin' to be good for General Motors." But it's a question of what context you view it in.

You know, the competition for students that we've had where the effort has not been directed outward to try to attract more students to the University, but to try to get some of those students over in Arts and Sciences to take courses in home economics or, you know somewhere else in the—. That's a fatal, really a fatal type of competition. It's not constructive. It's pretty hard to have a profitable, comfortable college of business without having a profitable, comfortable university in the sense of the total university doing its job, and being recognized as doing its job, and being rewarded for doing its job,

before that one college can be rewarded. And that's the kinda attitude we've been working at trying to change more than anything else, is to try to get people to—and we think that tryin' to discuss things at a policy level may encourage that. Certainly, the kind of logrolling you had in the course approval system encouraged just the opposite kind of attitudes. The dean went into the Academic Council to protect his turf always. And it came down to very specific issues about approval of courses and things like that. So to the extent that we can get that type of issue out of the Council, then we have a chance to get the other kinds of issues in, and hopefully change the thinking of some of the deans. You know, I think we're makin' some progress there.

Oh, with some new deans and some younger blood, maybe—.

Helps a lot, helps a lot. I think there's some hope for some of the younger ones, not all of 'em.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

I would say generally that the Chancellor's office has taken a hands-off attitude toward—well, really, *all* personnel decisions we've made here on this campus. His role as Chancellor excludes the consideration of personnel matters and the only time that I can recall that he ever injected himself in *any* way into a personnel decision is when he advised me to withdraw Bob Gorrell's nomination as Academic Vice President. And there, he was more concerned with *my* relationship with the Board than he was, you know, trying to express any opposition to Bob. In fact, when he first heard that I was considering Bob for the position, we had the initial steps here on campus, the whole hullabaloo started, he was very pleased with the nomination, and somewhat surprised with the campus reaction. I think he saw Bob as sort of the automatic choice for that position, assuming that I would want him to take the job. That's the only time, I guess. There have been times when I have discussed personnel matters with the Board for a long time and it's nice to know where your trouble's gonna come from, in advance

of a nomination. On the Stafford nomination*, for example, I asked, not in the sense at all of wondering whether I should bring it forward—no question it was gonna be brought forward after the decision was made—but just in terms of his knowledge of the Board members, where might I have problems?

The normal procedure in dealing with the Board, we deal with the Board through the Chancellor's office in all matters *except* personnel. The agenda, for example, the Chancellor always expresses whether he recommends approval or not approval after each item on the agenda, except for (and that's true of all divisions), except for personnel, and the Chancellor's recommendation never appears there. He plays an active role in Board meetings, but in the executive sessions he rarely ever speaks unless somebody raises and directs to him some type of procedural question.

*Rebecca Stafford, Dean of Arts and Science

I think, generally, my efforts here—when I came here, Neil was regarded by the academic community here on this campus almost as an interloper, I think. That may be too strong, but I don't think it'd too strong—a high degree of hostility to him, I guess in part because his own background is not academic. I detected some feeling that he'd sort of preempted the Chancellor's post, sort of created it for himself. I'm not sure that—but I think that different people made that specific charge, I'm not sure. That was my inference, anyway, from the statements that I heard. Independent of whether or not, you know, that feeling is merited, the fact is that he does occupy that position and there's no way that that kind of attitude can be beneficial to the University.

You know, I guess it comes back to what I conceive the President's role as being and essentially if I had to sum up in one sentence what I felt the President's role—it really is to get the University the number of degrees of freedom it needs to do its job. A President can't teach classes, you know, he can teach *one* class; I plan to next fall myself. I've already signed up, but you know, the President himself can't carry out the instruction mission of the University, the research mission of the University and the public service mission. The faculty basically has to do that. What he has to do is get the faculty the number of degrees of freedom it needs to do that job.

Obviously, the Chancellor is a very important element in determining how many degrees of freedom the University does have. Our differences of opinion, I think, basically (the Chancellor's and my differences of opinion), basically come back to what's involved in managing an academic enterprise. don't believe you can manage professionals in quite the way that you would manage, oh, the state budget office which he and I have both managed, a printing plant

which I have managed. You just can't deal with professionals in quite the same way that you deal with most other organizations. I never have been convinced that Neil really understands the distinctions that obtain in different types of organizations. You know, that's just my impression based on my observations of Neil and the reactions of the faculty to Neil. Both of those, I think, are involved in forming an opinion.

We have disagreed over, oh, for example, the extent of faculty governance that I obviously favor. I guess most of the disagreements we have probably come back to that at a core, sort of. Neil is a very forceful individual. He plays the game of one-up-manship very well. Little things that I would consider trivial for example, such things as, where is a meeting going to be held. Those things become terribly important, you know, a meeting in *his* office is a different type of meeting than a meeting in *my* office. Frankly, those subtleties are wasted on me, I think. I don't think anyone derives any advantage one way or the other. You know, it's—I know in fact that part of that is conscious. I've heard him talk about meetings with people outside the University, and where they ought to be held, so I know at least a part of it's conscious, but I think even beyond that though, it comes across unconsciously that matters that are raised out here, you know, sometimes defer discussion until some other time, usually when he's on his home ground.

By the same token, I find him far more flexible when he's not in his own office, when he's out away from the office, whether it be at lunch or—. I believe, you know, I could see *myself* and I think that there is some basis—it's not all ego— that there's some basis for it; I see myself as a problem-solver type. I do believe strongly in creative bargaining and I think that there's a bargaining process that can create solutions in a sense that something

new is added to the equation. I don't like "zero sum" games, you know, where anything that I win is something that you lose. I think you look for solutions that try to satisfy everybody's interest and that really is *creative bargaining*. I think Neil tends to operate with sort of a "zero sum" game psychology, you know, where if he gives something up, where if he loses something somebody else has to—if somebody else wins, he therefore loses.

That's just not my approach. In fact, I think we've had some examples where we really have produced that kind of results from what I would call a creative bargaining where we sit down—if you look behind the positions that the parties have, to the question of what they really want—we had it most recently in the (what was it? our accounting office, controller's office, something about the way of collecting fees) where the Chancellor's office insisted it be done one way, the controller's office or registrar insisted on another way.

We got around the table here in this office and said, "Now, what are the real objectives," you know? Not exactly, "Why do you feel it can't be done this way?" but "What is the objective behind the reason why you feel it should be done this way?" the fundamental objective. We got those lined up and we found there's a very little simple problem at the bottom of all of it—and in this case, we simply had to change a rule, you know. The rule was totally unnecessary anyway. But to change an—maybe not even a rule, just an expectation that certain people had of themselves. Here in our own office. There was some accommodation on both sides and we came out with a better system than either proposal would have been without that discussion.

What do you think of his proposals for formal job descriptions and the so-called administrative salary arrangement?

Well, I'm a little bit of an unorthodox administrator, I guess perhaps because of just my own background. I tend to come down heavy on the side of human development; at least I try to. I think it is nice to have certain fundamental parameters of a job spelled out. I don't like detailed job descriptions, but I think they tend to become ceilings rather than floors. In our classified service here we have, you know, very detailed job descriptions for most jobs, and in my own office staff I've asked people to do things and have been told, you know, "My job description doesn't include that." [Laughs] And then it's *not done*, by that person anyway. And things that aren't all that—to me at least—I've always taken the approach that people that work together get the job *done*, whatever the job is. I've been known to clean off my desk top, empty my ashtrays, all kinds of things that normally you wouldn't associate with the pres—. I even did the—I notice over here now, I guess I perspired in my hand or something, but finger marks along the door and the janitors won't do it, so I clean them off, you know, *finally*. It doesn't bother me a great deal to have to do that—it's just somethin' that needs to be done, so I do it. Some suboptimizing I suppose, but you know, it—the job still gets done. I really think that with a minimum set of, well, say the minimum parameters of the job outlined in a job description, then you leave room for the individual to grow in the job, you know. Any person worth his salt, if they meet the minimum job requirements is going to transform that job over time and make it something a great deal *more*, unless you have some reasons not to have it that way.

And I think the detailed approach—the detailed job description approach to what I would call position administration, probably a self-defeat—it's a bureaucratic type of measure in the worst sense, in my estimation. I wish

I were better able to defend that some other approach does better, you know. Obviously, it's easier to state philosophically, you know, but it's kinda hard sometimes to try to prove that it does produce results. I think it's also hard to prove that when you have the detailed list of specifications of what's supposed to be done, that those things are in fact done. They become a sheet of paper lying on the shelf somewhere or in a file somewhere.

I was somewhat surprised when I came here that administrative personnel did have tenure, for example, that they were paid off of a faculty salary structure. I guess that basically I agree with Neil, I probably am more extreme than Neil is on these matters, but for probably somewhat different reasons. You know, it comes back in part—my approach is termed what I consider a mission of the University which is teaching, research, and public service. If we had a counselor, for example, a Ph.D. in psychology working as a counselor—I think there are probably some intrinsic limits to what that position should be paid as a part of a university. Now, you know, it may be that the market considerations are, you know—in private practice the person might make a great deal more and in the mental health program, they might be entitled to a great deal more. But I think there are some intrinsic limits as to what a position, not the person, what a *position* is worth. And we know when the person occupies that position *outgrows* the way we define that position, then it's obviously time to move into some other area where their personal growth can take off and flower to a greater extent.

I think that's probably true with most of the positions outside the faculty. You know, I think, I do believe, that a person should be allowed to grow in a job, but I think that probably in most of the non-faculty, non-teaching, non-research positions as he calls

it, you know, there's a limit, you know, how much growth can obtain in a given position. At some point in time that person has to look for some other position in order to continue their growth.

Now it's very nice to have career ladders inside the University, but we can't do that in all areas. Where the faculty is concerned, I think that the faculty is infinitely valuable because they are our mission—they're the ones that *do* our mission. Obviously you have gradations, librarians for example. Here I generally come down on the side of the faculty with librarians, but there's a qualification there, even with me. The extension agents. Here again, I would come down basically I think, treating them as faculty—rank and step. But I think there are limits even there. In part, I guess, my concern there is that I don't think the agents really—well, first of all, most of them have jobs that are simultaneously administration as well as faculty. Most of them are county agents in charge—their offices are very small.

Anyway, I was very surprised that we have tenure for administrators. You know, a person who is hired to perform an administrative job, if they turn stale in the job or don't work out or—you know, some of these things happen—then it's a question of finding something to do with them. And I don't think the faculty should become a dumping ground for used up administrators. I think administrators tend to burn out faster than faculty.

The faculty, if the job is performed the way it should be performed, I think the faculty role is a self-renewing type of role. We all know examples where it hasn't taken place. But done properly, I think teaching and research has a self-renewal element kind of built into it. The instructor uses the same old notes year in and year out, does only a minimum extra reading in the field, obviously doesn't, doesn't—there's no self-renewal taking place.

I think those are probably the considerations that I emphasize in my approach, that the Chancellor does not emphasize. He sees rather that we should be able to describe the position of administrators more precisely than the faculty and that should be the basis of the salary scale. By the way, we do in Student Services—we'll go out and hire someone with only a master's degree at a much higher, not *much* higher, but actually a *higher* salary (say, entry level person with a master's), and pay more than we can pay a brand new Ph.D. in a teaching area, you know. So, we do recognize that there's an administrative salary scale at the entry level. We don't put the ceilings on though, and all too often the faculty, you know, the new faculty with the Ph.D. never really catches up with that employee, administrative type employee with the M.A. Once they're plugged in, they tend to sort of maintain their relative advantage.

The reason I asked that question at that point was that the Chancellor had been kind of pushing this concept when you arrived, and it seemed then to sort of die down and it has recently come up again and I wondered if that was part of your early relationship?

I was one of the ones that talked him out of it, encouraged him to discontinue it up 'til the present legislative session. It cropped up about oh, last year. It's something he wants very much to see happen, obviously. My own assessment is that the costs here at this University are probably greater than the benefits to be derived from the study. What I have not been able to assess on my own (and I rely pretty much on his assessment, here) is how much trouble it's really causing us in Carson City.

I know very, very well that the state budget office's got a hang-up about a few

positions, essentially people that somebody in the budget office knows—Mark Dawson, DRI. They feel Mark is *exceedingly* overpaid, you know. Maybe they're right, I don't know, you know. But they certainly feel that he's paid, you know, far in excess of what he should be, given the size of DRI, the nature of responsibilities and so on. There are a few others that I know specifically they object to. I haven't done an intensive survey, but generally I think, for every person that I find that might be overpaid, I can find—as a professional, you know, paid the way we get paid—I can find probably a couple of classified employees on our own staff that are overpaid. I know that's true in the Controller's office. We've had to deal with problems over there where classified employees were making simply too much compared to their professional counterparts—not counterparts, but people above the ladder.

In general I would say that classified employees generally have a better compensation, job security, et cetera, deal here than the professional employees do. It's very curious—it's hard to convince the—tenure's anathema, of course, to legislators and they think you ought to do away with tenure. And it's hard for them to see, you know, that tenure is something much harder to acquire than permanent status in the classified service. And quite frankly, it's easier to terminate a tenured employee than it is—at least in my experience—than it is someone with a permanent status in the classified service. And they get that in six months' time, you know, whereas tenure takes six years. That's a hard thing to sell, though.

I guess I would describe my relationship with the Chancellor as one of a cautious accommodation on both sides. Essentially, I've been allowed to run my own—been no attempt on the part of the Chancellor to

dictate policy for UNR. Now, by that I mean within the framework of Regent's policy (within the framework of existing Regent's policy), there's been no attempt to dictate policy, or minimal attempts, suggestions, once in awhile, but given and taken in the spirit of the suggestions, some of which are accepted, some of which are not. In the efforts to *change* policy, I think I'm batting better than five hundred, you know. Some things that I proposed as a newcomer have been tried before and found unworkable.

I can recall, for example, it seemed to me from very early on, it would make sense to consolidate the School of Mines and the College of Engineering, and I learned very quickly we'd gone through that process just a short while before, and no matter how rational it may be, the political ramifications of it are such that it'd be very difficult to pull off. I don't recall that—that particular one, I think, Jim Anderson had the data. But then the others, the Chancellor has been the person who has supplied the information.

On the whole, not a bad relationship, I think. We haven't had the autonomy. The fact that the Chancellor's located here in town gives him a higher degree of involvement than he would have with UNLV. With regard to the Chancellor or with anyone else on the Chancellor's staff, it's much easier to run up to UNR than it is to catch a plane to UNLV. It takes a lot more planning to take a trip to UNLV than it does to hop in the car and drive out here. And I think that UNLV enjoys a greater degree of autonomy, at least with the Chancellor, than we do.

I think, generally, the Chancellor's been more supportive of UNR than he has with UNLV. Well, in some ways. You know, no question, with all the formulas that we derive, the Chancellor keeps one eye on the political power situations. He's conscious,

as all of us are, that five Regents come from Clark County. That's a fact of life we have to deal with. think it's only natural that in my position, I think, that sometimes he's overly sensitive to that fact [laughs], that there's some things that swing on their merits, you know, without regard to the political considerations.

I think one gets very little feedback from the Chancellor on his evaluation of performance. And that's fairly important I think. And there's not much feedback.

Oh, I should mention, and this should be inserted back where we're talkin' about interference on personnel. The one place where it came to nothing—I didn't have a position— but there was one person that worked for the Chancellor and was terminated by the Chancellor and I thought we ought to have room for this person in the institution, in the University System *somewhere*. And that was Al Knorr. Well, at the point where the Chancellor terminated Al, Al came to see me— maybe even before the actual termination (I guess it was before the actual termination), Al approached me about a job somewhere in UNR. A very good background. I think a good man. I did ask, as I would with anyone else, I approached the Chancellor about Al—what the reason for the termination was and so on, and did not get a very satisfactory answer. The strong implication (I think I can recall his actual statement) that, if I were considering hiring him that I should know that he would find it very difficult to work with Al Knorr. You know, without really explaining why.

Al did go to work for UNLV and apparently has worked out very, very well. I guess the situation I was confronted with, if I was going to hire Al, I would have to fight the Chancellor to get—you know, I'd have resistance there with that particular appointment. It never became an issue—we didn't have any new

positions that we could have possibly filled with anything that year. We'd've had to take it out of the teaching budget in order to create a staff position that Al would fit into. He was not interested in a teaching job, but a staff job. That never became an issue simply because we didn't have any money to play with. That issue never materialized.

I have observed the Chancellor working with his staff, not too much, but you know, what I have seen I sympathize with the people that do work for him. He is a—you know, I rarely ever give an order, you know to someone, “do this” or “do that.” Maybe I should, but it's just not my managerial style, supervisory style, or whatever. I tend to make suggestions which I probably do expect my people to carry out as *orders*, but I think it makes for a lot, you know—it may be just a myth, but I think it makes for a lot more pleasant working relationships than being *told* “do this,” “do that,” “do the other.” And I think Neil tends to give orders. He comes on too strong, is how I would describe it, you know. He has some, obviously, very loyal people that work for him. I think if I did that sort of thing, my people would knife me in the back every time I turned my back.

I wondered whether he had encouraged competition between UNLV and UNR, or tried to encourage mutual support between the Presidents.

No, the system really doesn't work that way. You know, I think Neil tries, *usually* (there are exceptions), he tries very hard to play the role of Chancellor the way he set it up, you know. He tries to play it that way. He gets impatient sometimes, especially with UNR where it takes us years and years to grind out bylaws where he thinks that someone should sit down and just write the damn things. He

does get impatient, there's no question about it. But I think, in general he tries very hard to respect—as a matter of fact, when Neil was thinking about leaving, I was very much concerned about who would—you know, he was applying for a job—I doubt if anybody else coming into that job would use the office quite as moderately as Neil does. I wouldn't; I couldn't contain myself, you know. I too, tend to occasionally want to get things done. By being here on campus, you know, I'm constantly held in check by the people that are *here*. If I were isolated down in that office, you know, and sent things out to the Presidents that needed to be acted upon, you know, and months go by and nothing happens, I'd get impatient too, I think. You know I am a great believer in faculty in governance, faculty involvement, but not faculty in governance that keeps things from happening. Out here, you know, I can see why things are not progressing as fast as I would be if I were of f in isolation somewhere—you know, as he is in comparative isolation.

The system really doesn't work that way. You know, there are coalitions that occur. Neil generally holds himself outside those coalitions though, you know. Baepler and I will jump on Donnelly about something. On the part-time faculty issue, when—I don't know what all the concerns of our faculty were with the way the Community College was budgeting, you know, its—you know, in part they were sort of a union attitude about protecting the jobs, you know. Baepler and I quite candidly were, you know, our concern was that the, you know—if you're gonna employ part-time people, fine, but by God, *budget* 'em as part-time people, you know. Say how many you're gonna hire and budget 'em that way. Don't try to work in a budget request for full-time people and then convert—you know, say a person teaching thirty hours a

year at a salary of fifteen thousand dollars, and then convert that to ten people each teaching three hours each, and budget that at what—nine thousand dollars, say. You know, if you're gonna *use* the nine thousand to get that teaching done, then *budget* it as nine thousand dollars. That was Baepler and my concern and we ganged up, you know, and won our point.

We ganged up on Chuck [Donnelly] on the capital improvement fee. You know the size of the capital improvement fee, you know, affects what the student pays, and we feel ourselves in competition with the Community College with a lot of our programs. We argue that the Community College student should pay the same amount that our students pay. They were paying two dollars, ours pay six dollars a credit. We didn't get that, we at least got it raised to *four*, you know, and that was, quite frankly, a compromise position.

Another time, Baepler and I ganged up—this time on DRI—we didn't succeed. Both of us argued for the reabsorption of DRI into the two campuses. The simple fact is that over the past several years, in the same period of time that UNR's appropriations have doubled, DRI's (I mean *state* appropriations), DRI's have increased about sixteen times, I think. And both of us fought rather strongly to get something done about DRI's competing with us for resources, and it's duplicating—in my view it's duplicating our effort, I think. We are a research institution the same as DRI. We lost that one.

It's curious how things happen. You know, in the last biennium, DRI was the darling of the legislature (and in the governor's office too). This year it's anything *but*! It looks more and more like our—Baepler and my proposal of reabsorption could have well been a better—better for the University as a whole. I think Neil was opposed to that reabsorption.

I think, and part of it was, you know, it's better to have four presidents than three, better to have three than two. I'm imputing the motive there quite candidly, and I'm sure Neil's never even thought of it that way at all, probably has not. But I can see why he would in that position feel that way.

By the way, I am basically a cooperator as opposed to a competitor. If I can find—this goes back to what I talked about before, I'm basically a problem solver. Anytime you choose up sides, you know, and square off, you're in a zero sum game situation—that's my feeling. It's always important to keep the communication going and it's much better to cooperate than compete, by and large. And I think that approach has been fairly productive with UNLV, less so with Community College, less so with DRI. Although we've made some little gains, I think, with DRI. There may come times for power plays, but you put those off—they're a last resort, it seems to me. I think one has to recognize when that is the only alternative and not back off from it when the time comes. But, you know, you don't speed that time up too soon. At that point there're only two alternatives, win or lose, and the prospect of losing is just *bad*; you know, it really is. I always feel that, you know, that it's always easier to get beat the second time than it is the first time, so avoid that first time as long as you possibly can.

And I guess I feel I never *have* really been totally beaten on any issue with the Chancellor's office, in part because I redefine the issues in mid-argument. If I come forward with a proposal that's receiving opposition, then I'm very quick to go back and reexamine them. You know, what is it that's causing the opposition? It's surprising the number of different ways you can state the same thing sometimes, to accomplish *your* objectives, without making somebody else angry and

thereby gaining opposition. The way this System is structured lends itself to that type of behavior, I think. And there's not much chance that I'm gonna change the System significantly, or anyone else, or any other single individual. So you have to learn to work within it and get accomplished what you want within the framework of the System. And aside from the money problems, I think we've been reasonably successful there.

BOARD OF REGENTS

I'm sure that you must have been told, or discerned when you first came here, that there were some problems between the faculty and the Board of Regents—the Board of Regents seeing itself, not as the University's advocate, but as the faculty's antagonist.

And there's still some of that, obviously, on both sides. I think it's less than it used to be. I may be wrong on that. The Board has changed a great deal since I came here. In a meeting, a recent occasion, the Board was accused of being an extension of the faculty. I don't think it's changed that drastically. There are some antagonisms that are just inherent, I think, in any situation, boards of regents or trustee, whatever they're called, there's always going to be some bit of tension, let's say, between the board and the administration, between the board and the faculty (probably more between the board and the administration, because the administration is essentially a buffer). You know, a university president's main job is to (if you had to sum it up one way, in one term)—I think, what a president's

main role is, is to give the *faculty* sufficient degrees of freedom to do their job. Because the university's mission is not done by the president, it's done by the faculty.

You know, presidents and deans and vice presidents and all the other people that you have in an administrative hierarchy are really there to facilitate the faculty doing their job. And if they don't, if they interfere with them doing that job, then it's a—but, you know, you have to get those degrees of freedom. That would include money, enough money to do the work of the university. It would include academic freedom; it would include warding off interference by the board in the internal affairs of the university where that threatens to become a problem.

It only has threatened to become a serious problem one time, I think, since I've been here and that one concerns the foreign language requirement, where the students took the foreign language problem to the Board after they'd lost in the University, and where a board—where I would say that a board should, you know, tell 'em to go back to the

university and work on it there, they became interested and involved. And by the way, every time a board does that, they always regret it. They did in this case, too. But that was a serious problem and the Board members that were involved would probably have a hard time understanding why I would say it's serious. But when the Board would intervene and start telling the faculty, you know, what they ought to require for a degree, then the Board steps out of its role, in my estimation.

Some question, what *is* the Board's role? Obviously, they are, and to some extent they should be involved in interpreting the community's needs to the University, but not in a direct way like that. They should work downward through channels. You know, invariably though, when the faculty's taken its concerns directly to the members of the Board, or the students have taken their concerns directly to members of the Board, trouble results. It just has to be that way.

Well, these were some of the earlier problems that you were being expected to deal with or think about. I was just wondering, about your assessment.

Well, the Board changed so radically, you know, the Board of Regents. I think that with the state administration, we've gotten along reasonably well since I've been here—as well as I would expect. That may not be as well as the faculty or others would expect. That's in part because I think I do understand the kind of natural tension that exists between state administration.

If we ever, you know, if we ever sell—well, I think I understand what a university's role is. I think I understand why it needs the autonomy and yet when I was Director of Administration, State of Arkansas, I had the very same tensions where I identified strongly

with the academic life and with the university, yet I had about the same kind of problems that I have here now with the budget office and that any university has around the country with its budget office. They're built into the role so much more than they are a personal attitude. And I think it's awfully important for anyone trying to deal with those to understand that it *is* a part of the role, and that it's not someone's dislike of somebody else and that we're really talking about role structures as opposed to personality problems.

The question concerns the relationship between the Board and the administration, and I think particularly the President. I have worked with many boards, never with a university board as closely as this, although I have worked with university boards before in different capacities—never in this capacity. It's a strange relationship; it really is. You know, it was here when I got here. I think it's worsened under the current Board from what it was under the original Board. Maybe that's because the original Board that hired me had more deference to me than this one does. I was just someone who was here when they came, when they arrived on the Board. And bear in mind within five or six—five months after I arrived, we had five new Board members out of nine, which was quite a dramatic change.

At one extreme you have Mrs. [Lilly] Fong, for example. If Mrs. Fong wants to know something about the University, she'll never come to my office and ask. She'll pick up a student and, you know, then goes into a Board meeting and cites that as though it were gospel. Now, it's not that it's not accurate. It's just that there's always a bias inherent in any perspective—and including the President's perspective. I wouldn't be a bit opposed to her checking up on my opinions if she wanted to do so, but not even solicit my opinion, you know.

For example, last Board meeting, we had a swimming pool being built at the S Bar S ranch. And she'd gone out, and taken time to go out Thursday afternoon to the S Bar S ranch and talked to a worker out there about the swimming pool, and came in and voted against the pool because it wasn't located in the right place. The worker had informed her that it wasn't being done right. He didn't like where it was being located. He thought it should be located somewhere else. You know, there were perfectly valid reasons why it was being done as it was being done; that worker would not have access to the information. We do have a pollution problem with a pool that's below the level of the river, and so it's gotta be up fairly high. It can't be down on a low spot. There were, you know, real genuine considerations that dictated its location. But instead of coming to me or Ed Pine, or someone like that, she drives out to the S Bar S, talks to a worker and comes into the Board and with that as her authority, to challenge and actually vote against the pool based on what she'd heard out there. And I don't know how you can deal with that, I really don't. God knows, I've tried. I've given every kind of encouragement to get her to come here to this office. But it's the suspicion of a—.

Helen Thompson was the same way. If she wanted to know something about the University she'd call the Faculty Senate chairman, invariably. She had good rapport with two different chairmen, you know, but never felt really free to call this office, except to—she gave us money, things like that, she'd call this office. But information, she would not come to this office. And apparently it's true at Las Vegas, too. I've talked to Don [Baepler]. It's not just *me*. It was that same way with Miller, although not quite as extreme. I think that's partly because these are new Board members.

We have advocates on the Board, of course. We have Fred Anderson, who you know—most of the school begins and ends with the Medical school. That's his interest. He's obviously an advocate of the Medical school. Molly Knudtsen is the same way with Agriculture. Although I think Molly's more generally interested, but she's, you know, she's a special pleader when it comes to Agriculture. I think that both of those people bring biased perspectives. They don't bring a University perspective. Everything is viewed from the standpoint of how it affects their special interest; or at least that special interest is always not too far there in the background when they're having to make determinations on overall problems.

Of course, you have people who are interested in athletics, and we have a preponderance of those at the present time, Bucky Buchanan, Tom Ross, Chris Karamanos—those three are the—. Really Lou Lombardi, whom I understand was considered a very “bad” Board member in times past, comes out as being the sensible Board member.

It's a very political board. People are subservient to the governor; many of 'em, not all of 'em, many of them are; especially those that are pro-athletics are subservient to the governor's desires. We actually had a debate in the Regents meeting, last meeting, over whether the Regents should really ask for the amount of money the University needs to operate or if it should ask the governor first what they should ask for! I kid you not! You know, if that'd come to a vote, I'm not sure what the vote would've been. It was just unbelievable! That *was*. And I'm exaggerating maybe a trace, but that really was a debate, whether the Regents should find out from the governor, first of all, how much they *could* ask for. I've never, you know, even—that just goes beyond anything I could believe

I would hear a board of regents for a university say, and debate publicly.

I don't guess I have any strong supporters. I think I probably have one strong opponent. Lilly Fong is probably an opponent. I think that dates back to my removal of Jim Anderson; not that she's especially close to Jim, but she did know Elizabeth through her University Women activities, and did not like that move that I made. They've always seemed antagonistic toward me, personally, without really being able to fathom why. Except for her, I don't think I have any opponents. Helen Thompson, of course, became an opponent over the Bob Gorrell thing, but Helen had been a staunch supporter and frankly has appeared supportive on several occasions since she left the Board. So I don't think that I would characterize Helen as an opponent, in that sense, although she was bitterly opposed to me on that one issue. I think that really is the way of it; it fluctuates most of the time, depends upon the issue involved and what their particular stake in the issue is, whether they're a supporter or an opponent.

Obviously, the one critical issue there was the Gorrell appointment. I never have been able to understand why it became an issue it *did*. And I—you know, it's not that I'm tryin' to conceal things from myself. I subjected that to a great deal of analysis, and my own motivation and behavior also, I've analyzed very carefully, and it's still one of those things that kinda puzzle. You know, it's a fight that never should have *been*, in my estimation. I think it was, in part, union agitation. That was certainly a part of it. One of the principals—Jim Richardson, I think, although he cast his argument in terms of principle, frankly, admitted to me that he had serious reservations about Bob Gorrell as Academic Vice President, which he explained to me. I thought they were pretty baseless.

I'm not good at politicking the Board, which is what. [Don] Baepler does and I think Neil does to some extent. Not that I'm opposed to politicking. I've been politicking like crazy for the last three months, but it's kinda hard for me to politic the Board. I sort of presume that they oughta be interested in the welfare of the University, and I think that's my interest. And I think we oughta be able to discuss rationally, on that basis, more so than who I have to try to butter up to get support for an issue. If I'm dealing with something that involves someone's special interest, I usually try to—not, no I won't—sometimes—*rarely* I guess even—I will try to apprise them of what's developing ahead of time. But I find it hard to do that for some reason or other, to try to solicit individual support for a position before it comes to a vote. That, undoubtedly, is a mistake on my part. This Board wants to deal that way. I have not done it, and so far whenever I consider it (and I do consider it from time to time), my stomach starts churning and I back off, usually. I don't know, it's strange, but I—. It's one of my own behavioral idiosyncrasies, I guess.

Notable events in my history in dealing with the Board. I guess the only one I really singled out would be the student flap over the dormitories in my first year here. Students have an amazing amount of credibility in the public behavior of the Board. Very little in their private comments, tremendous variance. Their public behavior—just a tremendous credibility.

The other notable event, of course, was the Bob Gorrell incident, the Academic Vice President appointment. And I'm not sure where the individual Regents were coming from on that issue. That's one of the problems dealing with this Board; you never know where they're coming from. Well, occasionally, you can figure out. But you have

six people vote for—vote yes—for six different motivational sets, you know. And I'm afraid the overall welfare of the University frequently is not one of those motivational sets [laughs]. There've been some pleasant—I think young John Buchanan, for example, is a twenty-three-year-old and is developing into an extremely responsible-type Regent. He does manifest a sincere concern for the welfare of the University. He's a very ambitious young man; he's politically ambitious. But you know, sometimes ambition is a good thing. I think he's being very cool. I think if he wants to run for some other office, I think he'd have a good record behind him as a Regent, already.

The special pleaders, you know, they do make themselves more vulnerable by the fact that they are special pleaders, insofar as any future ambitions are concerned. I think you probably have, oh, three or four—Bucky Buchanan, I think, is ambitious, although I'm not sure as to what it's directed toward. Tom Ross is, I'm certain, although governor or whatever, I don't know. Chris Karamanos, I'm not sure about. Brenda Mason is. Obviously, Fred and Louis—neither one of those—and Molly, I think, doesn't see the Regents as a stepping stone to something bigger and better. Those three don't. Lilly, I don't think, really does.

Essentially, I take the same approach dealing with the Regents as I do with anyone else. I think a lot on my feet— or in my chair, as it were. I have a strong conviction that you can evolve a creative bargaining-type process where you can maximize, or tend to maximize, everyone's interest. The trouble is you don't know what the interests are. You wonder what their motivational sets are; you don't know why they're saying what they're saying, and that may be true often, but I never—in all the people I work with—I never find it's quite as strong as this Board of Regents. I can deal

much easier with legislators, frankly, than I can with Board members. And by the way, the approach I take to dealing with legislators is finding out where they are. You know, I try to find out who they are, what their jobs are. Whatever I find out about 'em, I *know*. If I try to take the same approach with the Regents, it doesn't work.

On the election procedure, I really don't have any strong feelings pro or con. This is my first experience with an elected Board. I sometimes think that, God, we ought to change it to an appointed Board. And I look at the appointments we've had over the last few years and I'm not impressed with the caliber of those appointments—the appointed person.

So, yeah, I really think that the people of the state have gotta become convinced of the University's importance. Right now the Regents are probably at an all-time low as far as public opinion is concerned. If the University is in not too good esteem, the Regents are in much worse esteem, I think, at the present time. Whenever I go down to Carson City, invariably, I wind up listening to two or three diatribes against the Board of Regents. It isn't always—now sometimes the Regents—what they're being criticized for are things they really ought to have done. But the fact is that people feel very free just to *tear* into 'em. They don't have any stature, any prestige, in the community as far as I can tell.

I was called down to Wallie Warren's office. I wasn't *called* down there; I was invited down for lunch one day, and he and I had been talkin' about several community type—University type projects that I was interested in, and meetings and parties and that sort of thing. And what he'd wanted to talk about, although I didn't know 'til I got down there, was, what could they do to get rid of the Regents? Yeah, and really not holding any

of 'em up as being worth saving. Although I think if he were pressed, he would say, "Yeah, we don't mean Fred Anderson. We don't mean Lou Lombardi. We don't mean Molly." Some of it. But just a general disfavor with the Board. Incidentally, I always try to defend the Board whenever I can, and with whomever I can. That's not to say that I gloss over apparent weaknesses, but I do point out the difficulties under which they work.

I went to the Student Leadership Conference with the new ASUN officials last week. And they had invited the Regents, and not a one of them showed up. And the Board meeting had been here the day before, here on campus. And none of the ones here in town had shown, nor did any of the ones from out of town stay over. Of course, the students had made a special invitation to ask them to come in. I explained to the students that, and I think this is true, that there's an inordinate amount of jealousy among the Regents. When one of them gets out and does something on their own— and they keep reminding each other that they don't have any identity as individual Regents, that they're a *corporate* body, they act *corporately*. I think, you know, I'm glad they do that, because most of the time we have serious trouble, somewhere in the background you'll find that some Regent has gotten out and done something or said something on their own about the University without consulting the other members ahead of time. But I explained that. That's one of the things that doesn't totally explain why they didn't show up, but it does, I think, it does militate *against* individual Regents.

It's only recently that they've consented to have individual Regents serving on advisory committees, for example. And the same rationale was there, that individually (this was true long before I came) they have no authority, no responsibility. In fact, as long

as Proc Hug was University counsel, I think that view prevailed, and after Proc Hug ceased being University counsel, then they began to take advisory committee assignments. And you might suspect Molly became advisor or member of the Agricultural Advisory Board. Fred Anderson not only on the Med School, but also the Mines Advisory Committee, peeling off their areas of special interest.

What we try to do is to think through our agenda items very carefully before we take 'em to the Board. We try to think through the possible reactions to those agenda items, and essentially, we try to deal with them through preparation. And you know, most of the UNR agenda sails through. I would say that we have *far* less controversy over our items than either UNLV or the Community College, or DRI. Well, DRI does pretty well.

Occasionally, we'll hit one that really does cause a flap. We're gonna have one very, very soon. We're gonna have the Military Science requirement, and that's gotta come before the Board and there's gonna be a serious, serious controversy. I won't even discuss it until after the legislature goes home. Things in Carson City are so delicate right now that I'm making no moves at all until the legislature adjourns. I think we have things going our way a *little* bit, not what we need, but we're getting some relief, I think, from the governor's recommendations. You know, I just can't let anything happen that would— well, I can't *cause* anything to happen and I gotta try to *keep* things from happening that might disrupt that very delicate balance that obtains now any—you can turn one person off, I think, almost *any* one person, and scuttle everything. And it's just that delicate.

Maybe you'd like to do in a little bit more detail these things that you have mentioned as having come before the Board, the problem over

student housing, for example, when the Board dug down into its special projects fund and tried to do something about living conditions in the dorms. Was it purely a financial thing where they thought the dorm bond issue was going down, or did they really care about the students, or did they think of it as an investment?

Yeah, I think conditions in the dorms got so bad that something had to be done, and frankly, we *couldn't* do anything. Part of our problem in dealing with the Board, they lay down policies for us to follow and then we try to follow them. But then they themselves violate those policies. I'd been led to believe by the Board and by the Chancellor, of course, that the special projects funding was totally off limits as far as the dormitories are concerned, and we've hit it for a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. We were aware how bad the dorm problems were. We were considering what way—what measures we might take to alleviate—. We had not reached any solution, in all candor. (Well, it's not quite true. We had decided to pump about twenty-five thousand dollars into the dorms that year, even before the—.) Well, what happened, of course, was that, without coming through any normal channels or anything, there was a confrontation. The students precipitated a confrontation, you know. We had a tour of the dorms. And they were bad. They were in some cases unsafe, and the Regents came through with twenty-five thousand dollars. It was not really a—I wouldn't call it a strong flap. It was a notable event, in part because it occurred so early in the tenure of this new Board.

At least three of the Regents are students at Las Vegas, and four were when Helen was on the Board. And I guess that creates identification with the student viewpoint. They were not students before they became Regents. Incidentally, I'm glad that they're

taking the classes at Las Vegas and not up here. I think it borders almost on a conflict of interest to have Regents sitting in classes. I have changed my view. I used to be an advocate of student representation on boards of regents, but I've almost changed my view, I think, on that point. Although not really; I think that a student as a Board member would be recognized as having a distinctive point of view. What we have here are Regents who are sometime students, you know, and are—their student viewpoint is not recognized and therefore not appropriately discounted, you know. Lilly Fong is what—forty-five years old, thereabouts? You don't think of her as being a typical student.

The Bob Gorrell thing, I've been informed they had a vote on whether to fire me or not. That was an issue you can't separate from Delia Martinez when she was in the Chancellor's office. And Delia is a serious problem to this campus. (I think she's a problem for all campuses, but especially for this campus.) Working with reporters, one woman who is reprimanded—out of the Office of Civil Rights in San Francisco. And the issue was, in my view, you know, totally distorted. We had not checked with OCR on that particular appointment ahead of time, but we had on similar appointments in the past, and were always assured that, "that's perfectly within your authority and is not contrary to Affirmative Action." And during the period when we were still feeling our way with Affirmative Action, any time that we have a question, we do tend to check with San Francisco. And while we did not check, I think if we had've checked we'd been told, you know. Well, we were told subsequent to the fact that, "There's nothing whatever wrong with your procedures."

But the main controversy was fanned by Helen Thompson and I think that Helen was

getting information from Jim Richardson, and I think Jim was wearing his NSP hat rather than his Faculty Senate chairman's hat. Every group that I met with during that controversy, they all seemed to understand and agree. The Faculty Senate, at the time the critical vote was being taken, there was a lot of agitation for example, in the Faculty Senate *endorsing* that selection. It was not done. I think Jim [Richardson] and Gene Grotegut both discouraged it being done. I refused to even debate the issue, frankly. But, that was not done—I didn't really want it done. I'd hate to have a split vote. I think it would have been a split vote. (Jim can control ten votes in the Faculty Senate and shakes his head, you know, that way. He coughs and ten hands go up. One day he lost the motion and said, "Damn, I coughed at the wrong times" [Laughs] You know [laughing].) But it would, with Jim there, it would've been a split vote; no matter how people felt I think they would've voted—Jim simply can't control that many votes. Well, I think it would have carried. I think as a vote of the faculty as a whole, it would've carried overwhelmingly. I think Bob Gorrell is that strong on this campus.

Well, it's a—that was a curious—. That was juxtaposed also over the fight I was having—the conflict with the students over their desire to fire Cris Cufflin in the bookstore, and for what I thought were grossly insufficient grounds for any kind of firing. The students had talked to the Regents individually and used terms, you know, very loosely. We actually had a closed session over this. They'd accused Cris of misappropriation of funds, for example, and what they were talking about was the fact that Cris had taken a trip without getting prior (a bonafide trip, you know, to go buy books for the bookstore)—but he had failed to get approval by the whatever board is supposed to give approval. The simple fact

is that he'd been failing to get approval for a long, long time. It had become a habit that whatever Cris had—you know, he did what he had to do. Well, you know, that may be wrong, but it's certainly *not* misappropriation of funds. And they'd used language like that with the Regents in their individual discussions. And you know, the Regents thought I was *def ending* a crook, and obviously, I wasn't, so—. But those things hit—the student fracas was never publicized much and they did hit simultaneously.

It's about that time that I consented to be nominated for the Oklahoma State presidency, by the way, for which I was not chosen and which I was never really interested in. I think as bad a problem as we got here, they probably've got worse problems back there. They have a member of the board that really runs the athletic department. And talk about interference in athletics, they really have it! And also, Oklahoma State is not as liberal arts oriented as I would like. This one is. Oklahoma, now, would be a much more suitable place, I think (University of Oklahoma).

Oh, incidentally, I was told by one of the Regents, Regent Anderson, who I think is a supporter, although it's hard to tell where Fred is in anything. He stopped by to see me one night and advised me that I—. Two things happened, I guess. Anderson said I was too intractable—I think he may have used the word stubborn—advised me to withdraw Bob Gorrell's nomination. Chancellor Humphrey advised me strongly to withdraw Gorrell's nomination. His point was that no matter whatever you—no matter what you want to accomplish, you've gotta survive in order to be able to accomplish. And my reaction was that there are some conditions under which survival ain't worth the pitch, you know. It ain't worth the effort. If I had to withdraw

the nomination, I'd have to quit. I would have to resign. If I'm gonna get fired, go ahead and get fired. I think I pretty well take that approach. Obviously no one wants to be fired from any position, *ever*. It's a black mark. No one ever really understands the reason behind being fired, but even on that—well, *especially* on that—on most issues I think, I can't see myself backing down. Well, I told Neil that day that anytime that my survival becomes an element in any decision I make, then it's time the Regents fire me then. And it really is not. I just don't feel—well, I do feel that strongly about—well, I'm not sure I feel that strongly about every issue that comes up, but my survival should not be an element in the decision. And I think I perform that way. Maybe that's why I'm stubborn.

One of the things I noticed in the Regents minutes, for example, was that. ASUN President Tom Mayer would bring things to the Regents meeting, obviously without having discussed with you what the University's united front might be, and you would have to say, "Well, I don't have any information on that."

Mayer and I got at odds very quickly. Tom wanted another Edd Miller, I think. I'm not Edd Miller. No way I could be Edd Miller. No way. I don't think I serve the students well by going out and being *pals* with them. I think that's time wasted I could spend much better. I'm more concerned with other things. When I first arrived on campus for the orientation, Tom [Mayer] wanted me to go out and put on an apron and a hat (chef's hat) and serve cantaloupe.

I said, "Now, Tom that's not my bag. You know, that's just not my kind of thing to do." And Tom resented that very strongly. He made allusions to it later. Then almost immediately in back of that, the Sam Basta

thing broke—which we lost the case, by the way. I just got word today that we lost the Basta case. I'm not sure, I haven't seen the decision yet, but it's, you know—. Well, all we lost was not removing him from Community Relations, but that he's entitled to have tenure in the College of Education. That's all that's involved in the decision—today's decision [April 6, 1977].

But actually the Basta decision was made about four months before I arrived, at the time of the work program. And the Regents simply said that you *have* to eliminate [pounds on desk] the office of Community Relations. They would not approve any work program with that office in it. And Jim Anderson, as I would do, eliminated it. That's the type of decision that a Regent can quite properly make. I might fight like hell with them. I might even resign over it, but that's their prerogative, and they felt very strongly about that. It was like a unanimous vote and it was an anti-Sam Basta vote. No question about that! They resented the fact that Edd Miller had picked him for the office when he was taken out of the Student Affairs job. And they really resented the image of the University Sam was presenting. And they didn't want him to have a title like that where he could officially—well, you can't stop Sam from being Sam. But they felt they *could* stop him from being "Dean Sam," and that's what they were trying to do. No question about it.

Anyway, Tom blamed me for that. He blamed me for following through with it, and that got—he still resents very strongly that—. When we had our recent court case, for example, Tom was the, I'd been told, was the person who went out and got all the people to come down to support Sam in the courtroom. The courtroom was packed with Sam's supporters. Larry Lessly said he felt awful lonely [laughing].

NEVADA LEGISLATURE ACTIVITY

Discuss some of the things that were mentioned to you when you came, such as the need to get on better with the state administration?

Well, I don't recall anyone complaining. I think they saw the need to be friendlier with the state administration. I have not been aware of any serious relation problems with the state government. Now, you know, any state, I think, you always have some antagonists. The states I've been in there has been antagonism between the state government, especially what I would call the department of administration component—by different names in different states, but includes the budget office, the purchasing department, the accounting department at the state level—toward the university. And the reason for that is, I think, in all those states—in any state that I've been in—that the university has a great deal more autonomy than any other state agency. The university sees itself as being something complete and entire to itself, you know. Whereas the tendency is on the part of state government

to regard the university as simply one more state agency. I don't believe a university can function as *just* one more state agency.

Now, obviously in some states, the university's accounting is done by the state. You can work that way. In some states, the budget office has a great deal more control over university activities than is true in Nevada. And a university can function *that* way. What the university has to have is enough autonomy to do its job. I think that the particular mechanism that operates in any given state, whether the university does its own accounting or whether the state does it for it, or whether the university writes its own checks or whether the state does it for it, whether the university invests its own money or whether the state does *that* for it. Those little mechanics are less important than the attitude underlying that. That's probably a hard thing to come to terms with, but all those are little symptoms, you know.

Tell me about your first exposure to the Nevada Legislature. This has been a really tough nut for

every President of the University, going back as far as any I have ever recorded, or anyone that's had any connection with Presidents of the University. President Clark used to have horrible problems. And, you know, the whole scene has been: President goes to the legislature (used to be the Controller would act as the lobbyist), and there were just disappointment after disappointment, after frustration after disappointment.

Well, first of all, you're gonna *always* have that dealing with legislators, and never one that—never a governor can do everything you want them to do. They have a different perspective on things than you have. I really think the big secret of success in dealing with legislators, and something I always try to do (I don't do a very good job of it, I'm sure) but the first thing is to try to understand where that person is, where he's coming from, what his problems are, what his interests are. One is to get reelected, usually. You know, most of them have political ambitions of some sort. Most of them have their own constituencies they have to work with, not just the public voter constituency, but the interest constituency that they're obligated. I think you have to make some effort to understand those sorts of forces that operate on these individuals. And of course, you have to always try to sell your case as one part of a totally consistent configuration of forces that operate on these people. Unless you start out from that approach, I think you're never gonna be successful. If you go in as a university president, you know, you get nowhere. I guess you can say, you gotta get down on their level, but I don't mean it that way. Being on their level means understanding where they are and where they're coming from, when they make up their minds how to vote and so on. I think

you have to be sympathetic with what their problems are.

You know, legislatures are—I guess this is true of most organizations like that—essentially, legislators are a helluva lot better than *legislatures* are. And it's awfully easy to let one's attitudes or one's opinion of the *legislature* affect their opinion of legislators, and that's always a fatal error, plus being *wrong*, you know.

The topic is legislative activity, and there's been a lot this year. It hasn't been very productive, but our issue has not been the legislature; it's been the governor's office. I think a combination of the state budget office and the governor's office and kind of a questionable involvement of the Chancellor's office, a question in the sense of not knowing exactly where he was coming from on all issues. At least I haven't felt that I knew where he stood on some of the things with the legislature—that the governor's office was doing to us through the legislature.

Oh, the worst thing that happened this year, I guess, was, the very last part of the session, the senate finance committee, at the request of the governor's office, attached a directive to our appropriation bill, directing the Board of Regents to create one or two business centers in the University, ostensibly in the Chancellor's office. I gotta think the Chancellor's in favor of that.

The sequence of events, the way things happened, you know, the governor had ruled out the Community College budget office. Almost immediately, Neil had a study by Kafoury and Armstrong recommending the creation of a budget office in the Chancellor's office—you know, not a budget office, but a business function in the Chancellor's office—that was circulated to the Presidents, and drew a strong negative reaction. We heard nothing more about it until it cropped up in the senate

finance committee. They had the full report; they had everything that, you know—and so there we were. Neil even advised me that we should not—we, the officers—should not try to fight it. I did, and got myself kinda crosswise with. Neil over that. I don't see how we can ever do anything except—when the Board of Regents prerogatives are invaded, I think we have to fight. No matter how we feel about the merits of that particular issue, as something we prefer, I think we have to fight that because the long-run costs are always too great for us to bear.

We lost that one, pretty much. It's kinda unclear just how bad the loss was. I haven't seen—the final language was modified some, and I haven't seen the final language yet. It looks as though we probably have lost it, unless we can fight it within the Regents, and whether we can, I don't know. I hope the Regents will simply say, "We're not gonna do it." On the other hand, there's no question that the governor exercises a very strong influence over at least three of the Regents, if not four. It only takes five votes to do something like this. So the chances of winning there aren't really all that good. Actually, I guess, there are four Regents that the governor *seems* to be able to control, if you include Fred Anderson. Once the Medical school has been approved, Fred may become more independent than he was last year when he was counting very heavily upon the governor's support for the four-year—the conversion of the Medical school to the four-year school.

Oh, lobbying techniques—whatever'll work—whatever'll work. Testimony before committees, obviously, and you try to make the very best case you can always. But you know, personal contact, having other people make personal contacts with legislators is, I think, as effective as anything else.

The best lobbyist is some legislator, whether—. You know, our concerns are

mostly with the senate finance and assembly ways and means. Only a small portion of the total membership sits on those committees. If you can find some legislator who's vitally interested in your program, and get them to speak up for you, that's about as effective a tool as you can find. There's always a chance of trading off there, you know, because that legislator might be on some other committee where the finance committee member might want something from them. And so we worked hard with all legislators, not just those on the money committees, the ones we felt we had access to. With some, you know, the attitudes are such that you're not gonna turn them around, and when you talk to them you just give them more ammunition to use against you. Ty Hilbrecht would be a case in point there.

Jim Richardson was lobbying one of our legislators this time on an issue (on this consolidation issue, as a matter of fact). Jim didn't say this to me directly, but it was quoted to me, and I think it was probably pretty accurate. After we lost the battle, and obviously this person had not done much to help us, Jim reportedly commented to someone that, "Well, at least they haven't gotta be beholden to that son of a bitch!" [Laughs] And you know, that's just a *totally wrong* attitude, because I happen—. You know, if he'd been thinking more in terms of what that person's problems were, you know. The governor pulled out all the stops on that issue. I had one person tell me that, you know, one person that ought to have voted with us, and he says, "I couldn't. You know, I've been here for six years and I've never had the kind of pressure brought to bear on me on *any single issue* as on *this* one." And this guy, I think was leveling with me. He was telling me the truth.

The budget office—whether the impetus came from the budget office, the governor's

office, the Chancellor's office, or wherever. They were together on this one, and they were adamant. And we had no chance to win an outright victory on that issue, and I think we made an *excellent* case before the assembly ways and means. We had no chance to testify before the finance committee at all. They did not invite testimony on this issue. They just did it to us.

But you gotta understand and sympathize and empathize with their problems. It's amazing how far you can get with that attitude. I think we've done well both years that I've been here. I was told last time that we came out with, I've forgotten how much more than the governor recommended. We did bring the governor around on some of that stuff last time. But I was told last time that we'd done better than the University had *ever* done before. We didn't do that well—I guess we did if you count everything in, we did that well. But we had much, much greater obstacles to overcome this time. This state does have a strong executive system. At some point in time, you know—the legislature's building up more of their fiscal expertise, but it's not there yet. The governor speaks for—the leadership comes from the governor. And insofar as the legislature has leadership, it's very closely clued into the governor. When you have that combination, you know, outsiders can't win. And we were essentially outsiders this time.

I think we still did reasonably well against the—we did reasonably well *only* given what the governor's recommendations were, and the extreme uphill battle we had. Because the governor had his heels dug in on this, this time. You know, I don't think the governor is all that anti-University, I really don't. But he's a very thin-skinny person; I won't say sensitive, I'll say thin-skinned. What began as a—I really think his initial budget decision was a very pragmatic decision, perhaps

encouraged by the budget office which is sort of anti-University. For some reason Barrett and others—. Joel Pinkerton, for example, one of the University budget analysts flunked his master's degree in political science here, one little sidelight that I think affects attitudes. But the budget office—well, they have people inside the University you know, that they think they are superior to, that make more money than they do. I've heard that view expressed. A lot of little petty things that all build up together and—. The University has a different relationship with the state budget office than any other agency of state government, you know. I think it's defensible, but they resent it. A whole lot of things. And given the fact that this—I've been in Barrett's job in a different state, you know. It's almost a characteristic relationship that the state budget office—. Universities almost invariably have more autonomy than other agencies, and state budget officers, or directors of administration, or state controllers, whatever they're called, the same general job, all resent it. They don't like it, you know, and it disturbs that little neat, ordered world that they like to work in. So I think it's just an endemic sort of thing, first of all. It's aggravated by some special circumstances here. But it was an uphill battle this time.

I really think that, you know, looking back, I wish I had—I didn't see any signals. Looking back, I *still* don't see the signals where the governor—you know, the governor didn't recommend what we wanted last time, but where we had problems areas, we were able to go talk to the governor, and he actually backed off. He told us very early in the session in '75 that he was not going to change his recommendations. for anybody. But, you know, "I'll back off in this area, if you can get the senate finance committee to add it in, or the ways and means committee to add it

in,” he would not oppose it. But, you know, that’s all we needed. Well, [laughs] we at least needed that, you know. We worked, I think, with Mike, with the governor, very well in ’75. And while we tried to keep up good relations with him over the interim, we didn’t make any, you know, real special efforts. He seemed to be approachable. He listened.

I learned later on that apparently, the state budget office had gotten terribly exercised because I had pointed out (and of course, I was new here and I was learning), but I found a mistake that they had made in our budget and pointed it out to the committees where they felt that I should have pointed it out with them first. I would have been happy to if I’d’ve caught it sooner, and would have if I’d caught it sooner. By that time, the time it occurred, we were already past the budget office and over in the money committees.

That would have contributed- - if they did feel—and the budget people have never mentioned that to me. I still talk to all of them, obviously. You have to. You have to work with them. We have outwardly friendly relationships, anyway. I wonder about, you know, if they’re really communicating their real feelings or not, though.

So we really didn’t do anything different going into ’77. We did work with our alumni a little bit more. Gianneschi helped on that. We had involved the alumni some the previous year, the previous biennium. It seemed to work, so we had made plans earlier to get ’em involved. And Gianneschi was the instrument that made that possible in a big way. But our presentations were good. *I’m* not saying that, people told us they were. And you know, the things we got—the relief we got—were in the areas we were talking about. So I think the presentations were good. At least they were productive, although not to the extent that we’d like them to have been.

You asked for anecdotes. I don’t know where this fits in, but if you can find a place for it—. I’m spending a lot of time in Carson City—last Thursday and Friday both. Monday, I go back tomorrow [March 3, 1977] and I’m just doin’ plain old lobbying, talking to every person that I can find that’ll, talk to me. Over the last—well, even after the governor’s hearing, I sensed that the governor was upset with us, with the University, and knew that he had been with our initial budget request. He worked hard against—*through* our Regents—against our budget request. I think that’s not kosher. Most of the ones I’ve known behave that way, anyway.

Anyway, several times over the past couple of months I’ve thought that, you know really, I need this to reestablish contact with the governor’s office even though they had already made their recommendations, and they were pretty bad, you know. We’d said they were pretty bad. Anyway, last Thursday I called the governor’s office (I guess it was Wednesday or Thursday) to see if I could get an appointment with Mike. And I had an ulterior motive; last year, last biennium when I finally began to make some progress and get the extra dollars that we got at UNR (and UNLV got ’em too), I finally buttonholed Mike at our Honors Convocation and one-to-one, just *there*, I was able to point out very briefly where some things he’d said he had *done* were really not *done*, that the money was not there to do the things he’d said publicly he was doing for the University. He went back and called Howard Barrett and sure enough learned very quickly that I was right. After all the fighting I had done before the finance committees getting nowhere, when I finally got Mike O’Callaghan’s ear, then very quickly things began to turn around. I didn’t really ask Mike to change his recommendation. I just pointed out to him, you know, “this isn’t

true,” “this is not right.” You always imply that someone’s given him bad information, you know, for—maybe just didn’t understand or whatever. You don’t—you keep personalities out of it wherever you possibly can.

Anyway, I went—I called to see—what I wanted to do was to talk with Mike and explain to *him* that pitch I was making to the money committees. It’s a different picture than the one I’m—you know, when I went to talk to Mike O’Callaghan, I was arguing for our full budget, everything we’d requested. In effect, we got turned down and before the money committees the situation changes; you lower your sights and you start lookin’ at (especially the kind of budget that we have now) what you really *have* to have. The budget we now have would *impact* our programs. How do we protect our programs? I felt that I ought to at least be able to make that pitch to him. I couldn’t get through to him. Usually, I pick up the phone and call Mike and get through no matter if he’s with somebody, almost.

Pearl, his secretary, said, “Well, I’ll have him call you back.” And I sensed that we had a little bit of trouble, and I was accurate, we were having some problems, as I’d surmised.

Anyway, the next day I got a call from Gene Barrett and the governor’d called Gene and said, “Gene, call Max and see what he wants,” you know. And I told Gene that I really wanted to talk to the governor, but I’d be happy to talk to him. I really hadn’t had a chance to sit down and talk with Gene and explain, you know, where we were coming from, and why.

Anyway, last Friday I had a luncheon date with [State Senator] Mary Gojack and I told Gene that if he was gonna be in, I’d stop by his office. So I walked by Gene’s office and sat down and lo and behold, the governor called for Gene. And Gene’s receptionist told Pearl that Gene was with me, but she’d get him.

Somehow or other then the governor heard my name, you know, and so that reminded him that I *had* called., and so he asked Pearl to get me on the phone. And so he called me over in—he didn’t know I was in Gene’s office as it turned out—but he called me, and came on the phone. And I assumed that he was calling because he knew I was over there and he had something he wanted to talk to me about, but no, he was returning my call, finally. I guess it was Wednesday that I called him and Friday that I got to talk to him.

Anyway, I really felt like I had walked into a buzz saw. He was madder’n hell at anybody associated with the University, on any number of counts. I spent well, you know, I spent fifty minutes on the phone; I finally got an appointment for tomorrow afternoon, four-thirty. I guess he’s goin’ to Washington and that’s when he gets back and everything. Anyway, I started to leave. I figured that Barrett’s and my business could wait ’til after I—*when* I talked to the governor ’cause the governor was gonna have Barrett there, he said. And so I told the gal at the desk in Gene’s office that I was comin’ by, I had an appointment up here and needed to get back for, and I was going to come back to Reno.

Well, about that time Gene walked in—Howard Barrett walked in and said the governor didn’t realize that I was down in his office and since I was there he wanted to talk to me then. I had the governor pretty well placated when I got off the phone, but between the time that I hung up (we hung up) and the time I got back over to the office, he had time to get mad all over again. And I spent an hour and a half just placating him.

You know, he’d say, “Oh, the University does—.” And I’d say, “No, Governor, UNR didn’t do that; somebody else at the University might have, but *UNR* didn’t do that.” Luckily, I had some facts and figures that supported it. It

was partly luck, not entirely. Anyway, I finally got to talk with him and I'm not feeling very optimistic, but our chances are a helluva lot better now than they were *before* I talked to him, anyway. I'm not sure whether we have an appointment still tomorrow or not, whether or not the one last week was supposed to take the place of the one tomorrow, but tomorrow at four-thirty I'm goin' to show up in the governor's office, just in case. And I'm not gonna call ahead of time, for fear he'll say no. I need to talk to him again.

What's he so angry at?

All right, the state budget office produced a set of recommendations that we could not have lived with. After our budget hearing, Mike did put in some additional money. You know, he told—you know, this is the way the game is played. He did, he put some additional money in the University's budget over and above the budget office's recommendations. And apparently his big objection is, that in all of the discussion, we have never thanked him for what he did. [Laughs] And in all candor, you know, I see the budget office as his creature, you know. And so, nothing's final until the budget office's recommendation, or Mike O'Callaghan's recommendation (his *initial* recommendation as far as I'm concerned); he doesn't see it that way. He sees the budget office as "them," apparently, and here the three-cornered stool with the budget office here, the University here, and Mike O'Callaghan there. I guess I should have realized that. In retrospect, you know, it was very obvious, we should have given Mike a pat on the back. But that was apparently the thing, the *bone* that was stuck in his craw. There were others too, but that was the main one. He really is mad at the Community Colleges, for example, but God, he shouldn't blame us. I

kept tryin' to tell him, you know, "Don't blame us for the Community College."

He said, "You come at me from the standpoint of UNR, whereas I gotta deal with the total University System."

I says, "No, you don't. UNR has separate appropriation areas; if you're mad at them, you can put money in UNR's without—"

"No, I can't do that."

And I said, "Well, you're talkin' about political things, now. I'm talkin' about what *can be done*."

Anyway, I came back and worked out—at least I, you know, if you want somebody to do something, you gotta find a way to help 'em to do it. And I came back and spent a big part of the weekend finding out a way to help him do what I want him to do assuming he's *inclined* to do it, you know—a way to get him off the hook, basically. And I got a device—our problems in our engineering disciplines and these are something that we have that Nevada, UNLV does not have. And if I can get him to recognize that different faculty-student ratio—we have to have about a twelve-to-one ratio in that area—it'll help.

And I just happen to have out on my desk now the Accreditation Review where they (ECPD) stipulated you had to have a ten- or twelve-to-one ratio, you know, and that'll go down with me tomorrow when I go.

I think our plans and programs for improving public financial support, and I assume you mean their tax resources, we came a cropper this year. We thought we had extremely good rapport with the governor. We thought the governor understood our needs. We thought the state budget office was sympathetic. And we couldn't've been more wrong, to the point where we're not even able to analyze really well yet, what went wrong, 'cause the governor still "ain't talkin' to us" very well.

That's a story in itself and a story about, you know, I think the governor really cut back on the University first of all, for just a pragmatic reason, tryin' to make his budget balance in the other things he wanted to do. But I think after we began fighting, and we *did* fight; we *had* to fight, I felt. I think it became a matter of principle. He's a very sensitive person, and it became kind of a matter of principle with him, and what he first proposed on pragmatic grounds he began defending as a matter of principle.

We'll still try to cultivate good relationship with the governor's office and the state budget office. We're not gonna rely upon ourselves to do that as much as we did this last time. We're gonna try to organize our alumni—in fact we've already started organizing our alumni to really help us in the next go-around. I would hope that by July of 1978, we'd have people already talkin' to people who could talk to other people about the need to support the University, and people in fairly important positions around the state. Not— well, some of 'em are identified already, but we'll identify others as we go along. And the first step there is to—you know, if we get people, I think, as well informed as—. We had a core of alumni this year that was extremely well informed and they were behind us all the way. If we can multiply that by twenty, and a very carefully selected multiple of the people that we involve, then I think that we can do a lot.

You know, I think we tried to build upon the information, the feedback we got from '75, and we thought we did, but I think the situation has changed in '77. And that's in part my lack of familiarity with the state, because no matter how familiar I think I am, I keep getting surprised, you know. Hopefully, we'll learn by experience if nothing else.

We did well, I think, in both legislatures; not as well as we should have, but well once

the governor's budget was. announced, I think. We did better with the legislature than we did with the governor in both sessions. In 1975, we had a economic tailspin that took place—occurred—it looked like, you know, we were just goin' broke, nationally, about the time the governor was making his final budget recommendations. Well, the budget office was frightened into cutting their estimates of revenue quite drastically, and you know, we'd felt we made a good presentation, but they still cut us back. We think it was traceable to that serious economic slide that occurred in late November throughout December, and didn't start recovering, really, until January. It never really affected Nevada, you know. We didn't have any figures for Nevada at that time, we just had national figures, and the market was collapsing and everything was happening. Once it did not become a disaster, it was pretty hard, and we were unable to get the governor to back off. Although he did back off and let us do what we could with the legislature. He sort of backed off.

This time around, he didn't back off and he fought us all the way. Everything we got, we got against the governor's wishes. We had some people in the legislature that were trading for us. Jim Gibson, for example, was doing some work this year for us; not very much, but Jim was very much concerned about the Mackay School of Mines problems, and he couldn't just hit that one thing alone. He had to do other things as well. But I think, and I can't prove this, but my guess is that Jim Gibson really is the one that horsetraded [for] what little increase we got this time. It came about probably because of Jim Gibson's effort.

Hopefully, conditions will change next time around. By that I mean, basic conditions which we don't have any control over. We're certainly gonna start now trying to do things we can't control, putting ourselves in a better

posture. We've already started, we've already started.

I think we've put together a pretty good work program despite the shortage of funds. In a sense, unless we get some relief next time, we've compounded our troubles for two years from now. But I think, I don't see any major needs that will go unmet in the University in the next two years— in the next *year*— because of the work program. There's places where we would like to have added staff, but we can't. We took care of other critical needs, I think. You'll find a lot of departments that won't agree with me on that, by the way.

Everybody's needs are critical, to at least one person in the department.

Yep! And especially when you're cutting faculty, you know. There are a few, Susan De Voge—I guess if I picked out one that I was glad to see—I barely know Susan really, but she impresses me as being just a top-flight researcher and a good scholar, and I would have hated to have to terminate [her]. She was on a federal grant and we had been picking up more and more of her salary the last two years. And this year we were faced with a situation where we just had to terminate her, and she was given a letter of termination, as a matter of fact. But we did get the special appropriation from the legislature that did carry with it one clinical psychologist's position, and that was of course her position. And I was pleased to get that one because that other—you know, the accounting positions, the Mines positions and so on, were things needed to add, but that's one we needed just to stay where we were, you know. So that was kind of a critical one. We have to pick up those positions next year, by the way, and we do have ten or twelve more the second year than we had authorized the first year.

In Arkansas, you know, I had Barrett's job, but a bigger job at Arkansas than Barrett's. I had revenue and other departments as well as what he does. In Arkansas, though, my responsibility was to make revenue projections, and to set what legislature spending limits were, and if I'd ever been off as much as (percentage wise especially) they're of f here, I'd been laughed out of the state! I'd been *chased* out of the state! Truly! You know, the end result would have been, you know, "How about cutting taxes?" Immediately, there'd have been a hue and cry to cut taxes if we'd had the kinda surpluses we have here.

Now we've had other, you know— essentially, the surplus is a cushion for a downturn in the economy. We had other tax cushions that we used. We had quarterly allotment systems where if revenues did not exceed expectations, we still had ways to make the budget balance. We operated on—you know, I was criminally *liable* to keep the state from over-spending when I was chief fiscal officer of the state. That's just the risk you take when you become chief fiscal officer, but I always had the controls to prevent that. But they didn't include—not appropriate—all the tax monies that we thought would be collected. We always erred, you never make it right. You know, there it was even better, I guess, to err a little bit on the down side. In other words, to not collect all you anticipate collecting, as long as it's not a major amount to where it becomes a catastrophe.

You know, we had—our agencies were work approval—work *programmed*, I guess you would call it out here—annually, and really quarterly. And we controlled allocation of revenues based upon the amount that would be collected, and along guidelines which would be set by the legislature, you know. They were structured—they could give preference to a university if they wanted to.

They had a rather complex system of allocation that they used. Nevertheless, the taxes that were collected and it was considered that they were going to be spent, and if they weren't spent then all kinds of questions were asked as to why they weren't spent. The general philosophy was that the people oughta have it in their pockets rather than the state. And I tend to agree with that. Money lying in Carson City doesn't help the economy of this state very, very much. They do draw some interest on it but not much. The taxpayers really ought to, whoever they are, really ought to have those funds if the state's not going to use it.

Have you discussed that with Mr. Barrett?

Yeah, he just said, "That's not the way we do it out here," you know, "it's not the way we do it." And it goes back quite a long ways in history. You know, more and more I think Barrett's adopted the approach that the size of the surplus is somehow, in some way, a tribute to his management, where really it's not at all. It really indicates poor management because he, you know, starts off with a low revenue forecast, and that's bad management, you know, any way you look at it. But, you know, I think it's very doubtful that we're gonna change that anytime soon, not with this governor certainly, because Barrett's behind it at the present time, and Barrett's convinced Mike that they ought to have that large surplus.

PROBLEMS AND CRISES

You've got a page (prepared outline) here about special problems. You've got one on resignations. Do you want to talk about that or not?

If you want to. It's your story.

There may have been other rumors, and I guess there have been. I've heard it rumored that I was gonna take a job in the Carter administration, that I was gonna do this, and gonna do that, and how widespread those rumors were I don't know. The only one that had any substance at all (and very little there) was the Oklahoma State rumor, where I did become a candidate at the request of a friend of mine in Oklahoma. Had it been the University of Oklahoma, I'd've been a very serious candidate for the job; Oklahoma State I was *less* serious. I did go back for an interview. I never did take myself out of the candidacy, although Marilyn and I considered it seriously. After we went back we decided, you know—it was just about the time the story broke, we seriously considered not really

running for it. By that time, the story broke and I guess we were just curious whether we would get the offer or not. We certainly did not pursue it in a serious sort of way. I found

I still had a lot of friends in Oklahoma. I had a lot of phone calls and letters and so on from people that were offering to do what they could to support my candidacy. In every case, I asked them to do nothing at all. You know, I wasn't that sure I wanted it if it was offered in the first place, and I also wasn't sure that pressure really helps an appointment like that. If we have trouble with athletics here, you know, they're nothing like what Oklahoma State has. And they've got a board of regents there that just—it's more out of control than ours is, as far as athletics is concerned. They have some real horror stories. They'll get slapped with an NCAA probation probably before too long. And it'll be much more worse than UNLV gets; they do have some serious problems.

I kind of like Oklahoma politics. I have been involved in it before. I say I like it—I did when I was there twenty some odd years

ago (twenty years ago). Whether I'd still like it, I don't know. They were fun in those days, probably more fun to me personally than Nevada politics. And also whether I think they were as much fun from the perspective of a university president as I thought they were from the perspective of a university *professor*, is always a question, you know. But, you know, my parents are, oh, you know, toward eighty years of age; they live just over the Oklahoma border in Arkansas, and there were certain personal considerations that I found appealing, at least enough to—and you know right now, I think that had it been offered to me I would not have taken it, but I don't know that for sure. But I probably would have wanted to talk to them some more before I declined. But my being a candidate did not have anything to do with wanting to leave Nevada at all. It was just a different situation that I was interested in for personal reasons.

Well, the Basta thing—we're still [June 1, 1977] in court over that and we're awaiting a decision to be handed down over his reassignment. Still no resolution—I think, you know, I think still we're right. I guess, my inclination at the present time is not to pursue it any further. I think we have definitely an appealable case, and we've already lost part of it. The judge ruled that Sam had tenure in Education, and I think we could win that, but—and I think we may appeal it still. I think we will not ask for a stay, though, as applied to Sam Basta. I think we will go ahead and reassign him to Education. I think the principle there of being able to use somebody where they're more productive is a fairly important one to uphold.

I think Sam has trapped himself. As a matter of fact, I think when it comes right down to it Sam is gonna much prefer to be

a placement officer than he will be to be a professor at Education. I think he will be miserable next year if he has to go over there and teach a full load, aside from feeling somewhat sorry for the students that he'll have in his classes. Any complaints we get, I guess we'll refer to Judge Gabrielli [laughs].

I think I discussed the Jerry Scattini thing, haven't I? Well, just briefly and just for the record and something that would not be in the newspaper clippings and so on, the first year I was here I got pressure from everybody, just about, to fire Scattini. And I said, "Hell, no. No way that I'm gonna come in as a new president and start firing football coaches the first year I'm here!"

I'm a football fan myself and I did get involved in it a little bit more because of the pressure, and the next year the pressures got worse and the reasons that I could think of for not doing *something*, at least, got fewer. Anyway, I called Scattini in toward the last of the season, I guess after the last game (or it may have been before the last game, though), to find out just what he had in mind for the football program. I'd almost been happy to hear him say, you know, "I'd like to junk it." He complained about the Far West [Conference], you know, that we weren't—we oughta be in—we weren't in a conference. We oughta be in a conference.

And I said, "Well, which conference should we be in? Shall we go back into the old Far West Conference?"

"No, we shouldn't." We couldn't compete with those teams on their terms which involve, essentially, no aid to athletics.

And I said, "Should we go into the Big Sky?"

"No, we can't compete in the Big Sky."

I said, "Well, what do you wanta do with the program?"

And you know, really, he wanted to stay with it, but he didn't know what he wanted to do with it, you know. Anyway, our second meeting, then, he was supposed to come back and have some plans or something for me, and he came back and really had nothing. So I told him he left me no alternative, I thought, except to ask him to resign. He didn't wanta resign. I said, you know, "Otherwise I'll fire ya!" And he didn't want to be fired either.

So, that was the first of December. And he had been looking for a job, obviously all season long, it turned out; he had been trying to move somewhere. And he had about two or three offers he said, lined up, and they wouldn't reach fruition though, until around Christmastime. And he agreed, I thought, that if we would *not* make an announcement for some period of time—I think it was three weeks we agreed upon—that he would resign. And that was a costly period from our standpoint; that was the height of the recruiting season, and you really need to have your coach—who's gonna be coach—settled at that time. Anyway, we agreed we'd wait three weeks and he would resign.

At the end of three weeks he came in and said he'd thought it over and as a matter of principle, he'd decided. he just would not resign. And then he said, however, if we'd pay him a year's salary, he would resign. And I said, "Well, that puts a price on the principle, doesn't it?"

And that point in time, I had no compunction about canning him. I'd always liked Jerry up to that point in time, but I did not like the offer of a—you know, essentially buying up his contract. We did finally, I guess, negotiate a settlement with him where he would not be on our faculty in that ensuing year. Anyway, that was the Jerry Scattini story. We didn't keep Jerry hanging as the papers reported. Jerry kept us hanging for a month.

He seemed to have a lot of friends among the supporters of Affirmative Action.

You know, I liked Jerry, too. I thought Jerry was kind of my ideal of a football coach operating in an academic environment, much more than Chris Ault is, for example. Jerry seemed to hold his own with the academics. I'm not sure whether it's an Affirmative Action thing, but he was on the Equal Opportunity committee for example, and that probably would be the source of any Affirmative Action problems. No, I got almost no heat, I think, that I can recall from anyone on those grounds. Scattini himself had been involved in—you know, we have a separate set of regulations more or less for our football coaches. Scattini had been a party to those agreements. And I'm not that gung-ho on winning, but I think he ought to have some direction to where the program—where he wanted it to go, and he didn't.

I didn't understand this warmth of feeling from the people on the Equal Opportunity committee because they're the ones who are normally opposed to athletics.

To athletics, yeah. I think it partly came back to the fact that Jerry was the kinda guy that did relate well. He's a football coach, yes, but he's a football coach that did relate well to academic types, and not all football coaches do. I think Chris Ault is doing reasonably well so far. He's a pretty stern taskmaster. He's interested in how his kids are doing in class. He tries to find out, you know—well, as far as I know he doesn't try to pressure anybody for grades, but tries to find out from the instructors whether his kids are doing well in class, and then gets on them himself if they're not. I've heard several good comments about Chris along those lines from faculty types.

I'm sure that like most coaches he has some marginal players and he tries to program in some classes he thinks they'll pass. I don't know any coach that doesn't work that way, you know. He lost a good kicker last year and flunked out of school in his freshman year. A Chinese-Irishman, half Chinese and half Irish, remember him? [Johnny McDermitt] He had an Irish name. He was half Chinese, and could kick a football, uhm! Anyway, he flunked out. Anyway, Scattini was not kept hanging for a month. He knew exactly what the outcome was gonna be.

The Upward Bound Affirmative Action incidents, the Affirmative Action case, I stayed out of pretty much by design. It already got into the courts, and headed to the courts before I got here, taken more or less out of the University's hands.

The only fallout I really got from that was, a lot of pressure began even before I arrived on the campus to fire Harry Wolf. Oh, I had a letter signed, I guess, by Jim Richardson and Elmer Rusco, maybe (I'm not really sure about that—by two faculty anyway), when I was still in Arkansas saying that the first thing I did when I get here had to be firing Harry Wolf. And I never have found any strong reasons to object to Harry's administration of the Affirmative Action program. Now, Harry is kind of a bureaucrat, I guess, in a sense that when you give him a job to do, he's gonna do it. And that's been my experience with Harry in Affirmative Action. I think he administers it in good faith. He's not a "bleeding heart," you know, in terms of his own personal views. I'd be the first to admit that. But I don't think those views have affected his administration of that program. I found very little to fault him on. He keeps calling me up short and telling me how I can and cannot do things, or whether I can do 'em or not, and when he says no, well, we just don't do it. That's all there is

to it. That's the job he's supposed to have and I think he's doing it quite well..

The Smith case in my view is just a case of a person (incidentally, she's a woman) who wangled or wrangled an appointment on a faculty that didn't want her. And I don't think the faculty still wants her. [It was] a situation that was handled very poorly administratively, every step of the way. She now has tenure at this University and it should never have been allowed to happen in my books. And the fact that she's a woman is *totally* incidental, and totally irrelevant.

The Lilly resignation, I was glad to see Lu go. I think that she would never have been effective here. I kinda liked Lu. I thought she was a good person in many ways. She'd had too many bad battles that she, for whatever reason, had not come out of very well, with people that she simply *had* to work with in order to be effective. And they're people both inside PE and inside Athletics. You know, never would I have tried to terminate Lu, but for her sake I was happy and for our sake, as well, I think, happy to see her move on. She'd just destroyed, I think, her effectiveness; or whether she did it or not, she'd been destroyed. I had a big file over in my credenza that came out of a hearing, I guess, that was held on Lu some years ago. I've never bothered to even look at it. I guess that when she was proposed for tenure or promotion, one or the other, in the PE department. I've never even looked at it. She irritated me occasionally. I asked her one time to write me a confidential memorandum about things she felt, like the people that planned the new PE complex, the recreation complex, had not done things that they were supposed to have done, as far as the original scope of work was concerned and the commitment she'd felt they'd made to her.

I says, "Look if you would write me a confidential memorandum, I'll look into all of 'em."

Well, the memorandum arrived. It was dittoed. [Laughs] And I sort of object to that sort of thing, you know. It'd been widely distributed on campus before I ever saw it. I still resent—and this has happened to me several times here on campus—I still resent people writing *me* memoranda which they simultaneously xerox and send all over campus, or obviously send elsewhere on campus. And generally, I tend to ignore those when I get 'em, by the way. I don't respond to that sort of thing. It's just a matter of my stubbornness, I suppose.

The NCAA investigation is a case where we, probably, in principle were wrong, but given the—I don't guess anyone really understands our position, or *my* position in NCAA. The rule that we had to apply (according to NCAA) to Edgar Jones simply did not produce the result that NCAA wanted produced. I think probably as far as what the spirit of what NCAA wanted the rule to accomplish, NCAA was right. But you know, I think, where the rights of a third party—in this case Edgar Jones—are involved, you have to come back and look at what the rule says. My first reaction was, "Hell, kick him out of school if his grades aren't up to where they should be." And it didn't take our attorney long to convince me that that wasn't as easy as it's said. You had to have some basis for kicking somebody out of school after they'd been admitted. And especially that was the time when the Buckley Amendment which had just been passed had just become effective, and I guess the Buckley Amendment got involved. I don't recall exactly how, but it became involved in that some way. We were very concerned about not violating the Buckley Amendment as I recall.

I think the high school was at fault. I think the high school should have certified on the transcript some courses that he apparently took in high school which they did not certify on the transcript. But the NCAA rule clearly said at that time (it's been revised twice since then)—but at that time, the NCAA rule said that the student should have a 2.0 GPA based on all work taken *and certified* on the official high school transcript. And high school transcript that we got signed, certified by the principal *had* a 2.3 average—2.23 I guess it was. Anyway, we're in court—we're in court just technically. Actually, it's now *Edgar Jones vs. NCAA*, the rest [are] just along for the ride. We refused to kick him out of school until such time that the NCAA took action against us that penalized us. Didn't kick him out of school. At that time they didn't ask for that. Oh boy, NCAA's crazy too. The first year, while we were fighting it, we had to kick him out of school, suspend all aid payments to him. We couldn't even pay the kid's way back to New Jersey, without being considered even more wrong than we already were.

The second year, after he finished the first year and enrolled the second year, all they asked then was to declare him ineligible; he could stay in school and keep his aid, in the second year, but not in the first year. Crazy! So, it was somewhat easier in a sense; it was somewhat easier to declare him ineligible the second year than it was the first year and it finally came to a head in the second year.

The big disappointment that I've had here is the fact that there just *hasn't* been any resources to work with. Each year, I have started off the year trying to balance a budget. Each year that I've been here, the resources have been over-committed, and we really haven't been able to generate the additional resources.

This year was a very critical year to me. And the reason why the governor's budget was so devastating on me personally, I think, is that I really had hopes that next year we could *do* something in terms of correcting some problems, as well as to sort of, not exactly put my stamp on the institution, but nevertheless feel like I'm doing something that really is constructive. I guess balancing a budget is constructive; it's better to be balanced than unbalanced, but it's hard to get excited about it, you know.

If your energy bill is double what you think it's going to be at the time you start the year, as it was one of those years; we had to find—what—\$370,000. That much over what we had work programmed, and that was in '74 or '75, I guess [refers to notes] —the first year I was here. We had work programmed about \$500,000 for utilities and they ran over \$800,000, and we had to *find* the money, you know. The next year, the bill (second year) would be that much higher still, and we simply *could* not work program that much money. We balanced our work program my second year by (really, the next two years both)—by not putting enough money in the utility budget. We just couldn't find enough money, without terminating people in some other areas. Most of our money goes for salaries, and we had to really terminate people—we *would* have had to—to balance the work program, so we fudged.

We just didn't put enough money in the B and G area, hoping that salary savings, and so on, that accrue during the year would be enough to cover it. In both cases, we did, but you have to pinch every penny, then. If you start out that way, you have to pinch every penny all during the year, you know, to—you know you're gonna need it, because you started the year short in the utility category [laughs].

We've been lucky in that sense, we've had two very mild winters. They're not lucky from the standpoint of the overall welfare of the region. We need more snow, more cold weather, but from the standpoint of our budget, we've been lucky by having two warm winters.

We have had money troubles. I guess I'm very sensitive about that 'cause I, you know, when I came here and saw what the financial picture at the University was, you know, this is one place where I felt like we ought to be able—. Well, I won't say I was, you know—didn't think it was goin' to be automatic but, well, out at the University of Arkansas as chairman you know, I looked at the number of majors they had and knew damn well that we ought to have at least three times that many and with very little effort. I'd had enough experience elsewhere to know that there's just a reservoir of political science majors there waiting to be identified, you know, and if you've got a program they'll step up and identify themselves. And sure enough, we went from about forty to about two hundred in a matter of a couple or three years' time. We finally provided a program for all those people that would want to major in political science.

And I guess I kinda felt, not quite that easy about the problem here, but I really felt like the serious funding troubles that UNR had in the past would simply *have* to be alleviated, that, you know, the legislature and the governor's office simply *couldn't* starve—keep starving this University the way they were. So far I've been proved wrong in two different sessions. We, you know, everyone—in the last session we got about five hundred thousand a year more over the governor's recommendation. Everybody was bragging—well, it never had been done before. Well, the end result is that this year, just to stay where we are, I need a *million* dollars more each year, and frankly I'm

not very optimistic with the chances of getting it. I mean, a million more just to stay where we are—. That's not quite true, *stay where we are*, if you consider adding additional faculty to keep a program accredited, *staying where you are*. You know, the programs are accredited now. If we stay where we are, we're gonna lose accreditation in some of these areas, so when I say *stay where we are*, I mean in essence improving programs to the point that we can keep them accredited. You know, it would be a marked improvement. Two more accountants would make a big difference in the accounting department. You know, it *is* improvement, but it's not—what I'm saying, we're not really adding any new mission, any new programs. Just doin' what we're doin', *tryin'* to do now.

Other problems have really captured much of our attention recently. The legislatively-mandated, governor-pushed business center consolidation is kind of a bad experience from our standpoint. We're tryin' to avoid it entailing more cost to UNR. It is gonna require additional space. We've been playing "musical chairs" trying to find—or getting ready to play musical chairs to find space to put about six or seven or eight additional people. We probably are going to combine—well, the Ag College has developed its own fiscal staff over the years and we're probably gonna bring them back under the general University fiscal staff, and do some, oh, what I'd call *policing* internally, at the same time that we're doing what the legislature mandated.

It's gonna be a very painful process. Some of the Regents have already served notice that, you know, they're just gonna fight it all the way. I don't know what they're gonna fight, you know. The legislature mandates and we try to carry it out and somehow blame us for trying to do what they've been told they must do. But we'll see the way it goes.

Also we seized upon that to forestall a development of a fiscal office in the Medical school. They were clearly heading for, oh, a duplication of most of our business functions over in the Medical school and we were aware of it, and fully determined that it should not happen, but this gave us an additional resolve to keep it from happening. The Med school's unhappy about that. We've also told them the Medical school wants to develop a public relations effort and told 'em if they can provide the funds, but it's gonna be done, once again, in the Gianneschi office, the Development office.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PRESS RELATIONS

I guess the person that I'm as pleased about as any other would be the hiring of Harry Gianneschi for director of Alumni Relations and Development. I was upset when I came here; I felt that the alumni were almost anti-University. They were very possessive toward the University, but not very supportive of it and very critical, critical in not a very constructive way—almost hypercritical, of the University. It was almost a *us* versus *them* situation. That was true also in the Booster's organizations—very strange relationships. In both cases, very possessive, in both cases, not supportive but critical and the criticism is really *not* constructive criticism.

I felt like we had to have an alumni director. There was some pressure to move Clela Oliver, the secretary, over there into that job. I really felt like we had to have some type of attention both in the Booster area and in the alumni area. We have both, of course, Clayt Rabedeaux, who is the Booster's executive secretary. That has not worked out nearly as well as the alumni has so far.

But we had an alumni search committee—I was very skeptical. Well, at the outset, the alumni initially wanted to require that the person be a UNR graduate to be alumni director. I didn't say no, but I did suggest that they ought to think very carefully about that. You know, we only had a total of about eighteen thousand graduates in our history, if that many, and a remarkable number of those have been in the last few years. So if you go back to, you know, people thirty—you know, the pool really comes down to a very small pool. I didn't tell 'em no, but they went back and decided on their own that they should not limit it to a UNR graduate. I think I would not have agreed if it had come to that, but it never did. So, that was happy.

I had a strong search committee. The only insider I had on that committee I guess was Dick Dankworth, maybe one other faculty. I'm not really sure. They turned up a good slate of candidates and Gianneschi was, you know, far and above the outstanding one. In fact, I guess he was the only one—I'm not sure if we hadn't hired Gianneschi if they'd even

recommend anybody else, because everyone was captivated by him. I was impressed, not captivated, but impressed. But after he'd been here, I've become almost captivated. He's a tremendous worker; he works hard. He's enthusiastic. He's never so busy he won't take on some other assignment, you know. You know, he obviously has a good future either here or somewhere else, but you just don't find people like him very often—totally committed to this job. And of all the ones I've hired, I think, he's one that I would—(of the ones I've been able to see perform in their job, so far) he's the best choice for the job.

And you know, of course, we do have serious problems in our whole external relations area. Obviously my own view is (check this a couple, three years from now), I can look down the road, though, and see Harry Gianneschi in three or four years as being Vice President for University Relations, bringing under his wing a lot of things besides Development and Alumni Relations: information, news service, publications, quite a few things of that sort. And I would say as a time table (if he develops as the way I think he will or as he has so far), I would say within three years if he's still here at that point in time. And that's a serious question, that obviously—he has offers now that I know about.

Dankworth has performed well. Part of the problem was that I was working with existing resources. I didn't have any chance of creating a new position, really, and I really wanted to make some important changes. I was impressed with Dick and I still am. He's not the same caliber person, I think, that Gianneschi is. He has ten ideas a week, or so, but three of 'em may be workable, and he has a difficult time distinguishing between the ones that are workable and the ones that are not workable. He requires more careful attention, shall we say.

I guess the hardest thing I had to adjust to here is our press relations, in part because I have always enjoyed very good relationships with the press, and that obviously has not been true here. I tend to be quite candid with the press. I've had occasion to question that approach; I haven't changed it, but I have had occasion to question whether it's good or not. I guess the main reason why I haven't changed it, I can't think of any viable alternatives. All the others seem to have serious problems attaching to them.

I think it's in part the nature of the local press, though. I really am not impressed with the local newspapers, as a responsible member of a community. I guess in my bad moments, I regard them almost as a cancer upon the civic body. In my lighter moments, I refer to the coverage of the University news at least, as the "downtown *Sagebrush*." I like the *Sagebrush* maybe even better—more responsible.

But in any number of areas, I find that the local—not just the University, but other institutions—I find that there's almost a suicidal impulse on the part of the papers, you know. They seem to be out to destroy Reno as a community. Why something—you know, I recognize that good things don't necessarily have the same news value that bad things do. I'm not opposing their coverage of murders and suicides (we had a suicide this morning [April 29, 1977], by the way, on campus, which I'm sure attracted some coverage). And in no way am I suggesting that things like that should not be reported. Newspapers have to be newspapers. Reporters have to be reporters. The news must be covered. But I've been to operas, symphonies, Little Theater performances, where, yeah, you can find things to knock, you know, but you can also find things to praise, and they always knock rather than praise.

Anyhow, I've found it very difficult to deal with the press. It goes back to—I think, the very first bad experience I had was a speech I made to Sigma Delta Chi, the local journalism fraternity. And I spent a lot of time on the speech, and I thought I made a fairly good speech. One of the reporters asked for a copy of the text afterwards and I did give him—I only had the one copy; it was a marked up copy, but it was, you know, legible. And I gave it to him. I had a lot of points that I thought were pretty good. But the total of news coverage was limited to a *misquotation* in response to a question asked by Warren Lerude. And that was the *total* extent of the coverage of the event. And that was my first exposure, and it's been downhill ever since. [Laughs] That's an exaggeration, that's an exaggeration [laughing], but it hasn't been good. And, you know, I do find that the University is not unique in this regard, that people all over town feel much the same way about the newspapers.

We do need a public relations office. We don't have one. I think we'll start making some moves there in this coming year. Ed [Olsen] is getting to the point where he's less and less reliable. You know, it's his health, nothing about his character, it's just his health. But, you know, beyond that, he's really a news writer. He's not a public relations man as such, and I think that my present intent, and some things that happened—. Well, what happened was the Chancellor refused to finance twenty-five percent of Ed's salary this time, cut it back to ten percent. And that essentially means we have to pick up the difference. And I think I'm gonna try to make a condition of doing that, that he be located organizationally under Gianneschi. And obviously, I'm looking toward building up Gianneschi's role in his office, and role into something much more than just Alumni Relations and Development.

I think that Ed can be used more productively there. And he does, you know—he's a news writer. I think he can do a lot more things in that role, and do what he's doing now, plus other things, in supporting alumni relations, development activities. At the same time, Harry will be able to provide some back-up for Ed when Ed just can't be here (and that's, frankly, more and more frequently now).

So, you know, you're torn between coming in and trying to do things all at one time, or taking modest little steps towards some objective and in this one I've decided *not* to do a dramatic reorganization, but to—this is the first step toward creating what I think will eventually be a full-blown University Relations operation. That's what I have in mind for it, but I wanta move to it gradually.

The only person I've identified that really I think is adequate for the job is Harry [Gianneschi], and I think he's a little bit young to take on a major reorganization. But if he can have—it can be—I'm not really sure what the limit of his capabilities are, either. I think—I hate to overwhelm him—but if you can let him grow, you know, with the size of the organization, I think in two or three years we can really have something, and that's kinda the time frame I'm working with.

What Ed [Olsen] does, he does well, when he's able to do it, you know. But the scope of what he's able to do is too limited, and his health is just not good enough to support, well, the kind of, you know—I'll bet for the last three or four weeks, whenever I've had any immediate need for information out of him, Ed's been gone, you know. You just can't have that.

As far as plans and proposals for improving our public relations (I'll jump back up with some of those first names a little later), I still haven't changed my basic philosophy. Maybe I

have to at some point in time. But I still think that good public relations have to grow out of, and be grounded in public functions. And you know, I do spend a lot of time on public relations myself, but I think the President *has* to be more involved in public relations. It's something you cannot delegate; you can [get] assistance from other people, you know, but it's a responsibility that cannot be delegated from the President's office.

I think, by and large, they are not as bad as many of us think they are. You know, the Chamber of Commerce thing with the legislature where they actually opposed our budget—that was not the Chamber of Commerce. That was a few individuals, two in particular—really it boils down to one (and I think we discussed that before), who got some support from only a couple of people—I guess three other individuals. And I've had, you know, more people disavow that action—more people *in* the Chamber disavow that action—than support the action. Obviously, it has never come to a vote, and I wouldn't want it to come to a vote. That's a place where any negative votes amount to a defeat. You know, unless you get unanimity, you don't want a vote on something like that.

We've made continuing efforts to involve people that I identify as opinion leaders with the University. Some are successful; some are not, you know. Neil Plath, [Chairman of the Board of Sierra Pacific Power Company] I think, has been won over to become a real supporter—he was already, but a real supporter now of the University. He was very proud of his involvement in the Business school study committee and dean search. He was supportive, did not interfere, you know, in the sense of trying to *have his way* at all. And the academics on the committee thought he was a very constructive influence. The closer we can tie people like Neil Plath

to the University, of course, the better off we are. And we will move to set up an advisory committee of the College of Business as soon as the new dean is on board. It will essentially grow out of that old study group that we had studying the goals and mission of the college.

And as far as the business community is concerned, the Business college is the one place where business support should focus, it seems to me. Bob Weems has been good in terms of Bob's *own* PR, but it hasn't spun off to the college even, or the University as a whole; it has been Bob *per se*, you know. And Dick Hughs and I discussed that in rather general terms without talking about Bob in particular, and I think that Dick has a somewhat different attitude. I hope so. I look for some change to take place there. But there's no substitute for involvement, but at the same time, you can't let involvement become dictation, you know.

Despite our budget problems this year, I was rather amazed at the legislators, at least, at what appears to be a considerable reservoir of goodwill among the legislators themselves, not the governor's office. And that does not extend to the University System as a whole. But UNR *per se*, I found a considerable reservoir of goodwill. And I don't think they were just pulling my leg, or, you know, making me feel good in spite of rather negative results that happened.

I wish I could tell you what our problems are with the governor. Obviously, for a public university with a strong executive like we have in Nevada, that's the most critical public relation you have. I wish I knew what our problem is. You know, when I talk to him (and I do talk to him, still), he raises complaints. I say that because Mike sometimes cuts off people when he's having difficulties with them, and he's had troubles with us, no doubt. I just refuse to be cut off that way, and you know, I've had to lean pretty hard to get

appointments to talk to him, make sure I get to see him. He never knows where he's gonna be, you know, and I just refuse to let him cut us off that way. And you know, he objects to the University. But it's always something that—when he raises a specific, it's always something that involves some other unit, the Community College, UNLV, the Chancellor's office, something else. And never UNR.

We hope to do things much differently next time around than we did this time. I thought we had a good relationship with Mike. I really was flabbergasted when his recommendation— well, flabbergasted when it became apparent that the Regents' reaction to our budget proposal was really Mike's reaction to the Regents, which I find terribly bad in itself. [It is] very, very hard to get to Mike, and at that point in time he was maintaining a lot of distance between himself and the University.

We've already started working on the biennium, two years from now. Really, it's not that long. We'll be doing our budget, the biennium, this time next year, you know. And that's the time we need to involve groups we hope to identify, I guess you'd call them opinion leaders through our alumni. I think we have a lot of alumni who are opinion leaders, and also I think that alumni have access to other opinion leaders. "Opinion leaders" there is a euphemism—I want people with a lot of *political clout*. That's what I really want, and you know, people that I can convince that, you know, the University *is* important, that we do have a policy to be dealt with, and get 'em to help us.

You asked about the alumni particularly. And I think like most universities, we have two sets of alumni (most universities, it's *athletic* programs); we have two sets of alumni. We have the Boosters and then we have the regular Alumni organization. One

of the major things we've accomplished since we've been here, I think, is the reorganization of the Boosters Club. I tried to get the decision-making group pared down to a more manageable size. It was bad, bad, when they had the big mass meetings where they imbibed freely, and then conducted their business afterwards. Now, there's no drinking. The board of directors meets—they go out and drink afterwards—but you know, they've adjourned by the time they go out and start having their fun. And at the same time tryin' to keep programs going to involve the mass of the Booster organization. We've tried very hard not to exclude anyone, but well, in all candor, it's more sort of "bread and circuses" for the mass. We've got coaches coming, bring films and talk to them, provide wine tasting parties which are combination social affairs and fund raisers. They've been a good substitute, I think for the mass meetings they used to have. At the same time, we've tried to keep 'em— well, to have a size group that can rationally discuss and reach collective judgment as opposed to the kind of mass, oh, mob behavior, I guess, almost that took place before [laughs].

We had a setback. Well, we had one setback. We thought we were trying to bring the Boosters' funding inside the University and that's come a cropper, I guess, temporarily. I don't think we've lost it permanently. We will have a partial victory. We'll bring the scholarship money directly into the University, I think. We gotta leave the Boosters' account per se outside, and that might be a better solution, in the long run, anyway. I'm not sure we want to be responsible for everything the Boosters do as a group. And when you control the finances, then you do become to some extent responsible.

The regular alumni, of course—strange, both groups were awfully anti-University

when I came here. Seemed like it was the Boosters versus the athletic program, the regular alumni versus the University as a whole. And I do think we've gone a long way toward—if you look at any place where I think significant changes have been made, I think it's there. The Boosters are for the athletic program, basically now. They've been behaving rather responsibly. Of course, we've had pretty good records made in football and [basketball]. We've very good records in all sports, really. Minor sports, [have been] much, much better than in the major sports; but you know, track and cross-country and things like that don't really attract the kind of Booster attention that football and basketball do. So the winning teams, or at least better records—have certainly helped and if we really fell back, I don't know what would happen.

We did not keep Scattini hanging for a month as the press still claims. He kept us hanging for a month, basically. We had made up our minds and made it quite clear what our intent was. Just after the end of the season. It did not become public knowledge though, until oh, around Christmas-time. That was strange in itself. Everything else around here becomes public knowledge almost before it's decided here in this office, but that one didn't.

It's the sort of thing you really can't do much about. It doesn't really serve any constructive purpose to try to answer anybody in the newspapers, you know; it really doesn't, or to try to set people straight. As a matter of fact, it doesn't do any good either. They'd dwell on that so much that I finally told Warren Lerude the exact circumstances of what had happened and they keep right on printing it, so it doesn't do any good there, either. I confided in Warren off the record, and if I'd told Warren where he could've printed it, I'm sure I'd've got it printed. That'd be another controversy, you know.

The Planetarium fund drive's an item you have on the list (prepared outline). I wish I could really say that I felt deep down that the Planetarium fund drive was an example of good public relations activity. In and of itself, obviously, it was. No one thought we'd even come close to raising the kind of money that was involved there. Insofar as the fund drive was successful, yeah. But in terms of *long term* support for the University, I don't really feel that good about it. I don't, you know, I don't say that publicly ever. Obviously, it's one of the things I refer to as being evidence in trying to build it into a more long-range—.

I think we did turn up with some people that we can go back to, people that did not support the Atmospherium fund drive for various reasons, but at the same time, let themselves be kinda committed to other University programs that they would support sometime in the future. So I think we got some chips that we can cash out of that. And even some of 'em who gave to that will give to other things as well. I guess the main thing about that was it was giving to nonathletic programs on a scale that had never been envisioned, well, in the last decade anyway, probably the last two decades.

So, it was good in terms of developing additional financial support. It got the University before the public in a favorable way. But, you know, we sold that fund drive on the basis that it was not a University activity, but a community—. It was not a University resource we were tryin' to preserve, but a community resource, and I think that the, and this is proper I think, given the way we structured it that the community patted itself on the back more than it patted the University on the back. And that's proper, you know. We sold it that way.

Dick Dankworth invested an inordinate number of hours. I think Dick really surfaced

as a person to be reckoned with, coming out of that fund drive. I think he gained a new credibility internally because of the success in the fund drive. Dick maintained primary staff responsibility for it.

I think it also gave Harry Gianneschi a chance to get involved in fund raising early on, where he probably, had he not had a vehicle like that, it would have taken a little bit longer to break the ice. He got to talk to a lot of influential people. I think he's farther ahead than he would have been having had that fund drive. The only other fund drive he's involved in in a big way, is the Morrill Hall fund drive, and of course, that's so far up 'til that point in time, has been a miserable failure. Actually, it's coming along quite well now, but not from individual subscriptions. We picked up a grant from the federal government. We picked up a hundred thousand-dollar grant from the Community Development. Fund, city of Reno. We just picked up a hundred thousand dollars, I think, from the legislature. It's not quite approved yet, but it looks like it will go through. And that puts us up around five hundred thousand, which is enough, you know, to do the major structural work. Still leaves some interior work to be done. But at least we can reach the point to where we can say the fund drive is over. And I think, Harry [Gianneschi] does feel that the Morrill Hall thing is kinda an albatross around the neck of the Alumni Association and I tend to agree with him.

Alumni contributions are dribbles and drabs for Morrill Hall, and we would like something more than dribbles and drabs for other kinds of programs. And we really haven't been able to convince alumni that the Morrill Hall project is a project that should be supported substantially, the same way that we convinced people they oughta support the Atmospherium-Planetarium. And I

think that, you know, we're looking toward developing more unrestricted gifts. That's what we always want, and as opposed to those designated for a particular department, or for the Library. We're not opposed to those, but we'd like to see more unrestricted gifts.

Why do you think the alumni feel this way about Morrill Hall? It was their idea to begin with.

Well, it was somebody's idea, in the Alumni Association. I'm not really sure it was ever anything but kind of a mass movement within the Alumni Association. I haven't seen that when I've talked to alumni, but a lot of alumni have supported it with dollars, you know, instead of ten thousand-dollar gifts. When I came here it had not caught on. If it had caught on earlier—. You know, it began in what? '71? '72, something like that? The most substantial gift was an estate that somebody had some discretionary control over, and earmarked it for the Morrill Hall. If you deduct that, plus another twenty-five thousand-dollar estate of the same order— if you deduct those two estates which really were not—you know, the donor did not actually say, "This is for Morrill Hall," I doubt that the alumni have paid the total expense of the fund drive. They did hire a professional when they hired Nick Lauri, I believe. I'm not sure he's a professional fund raiser; he's functioning in that capacity, though. But I doubt that you'll find that they even supported the cost that they incurred in the fund drive, out of other kinds of contributions. It hasn't—well, it's not a success, and it'll be good to get rid of it, so we can move on to other things.

I'm pleased with the way the alumni have come around. We've had some problems there. Last year's president was a recent alumnus of the University (Delia Martinez)

and she works in the Chancellor's office. You know, she would like to—is always tempted, let's say—to use the alumni position to try to accomplish things that she thinks oughta happen probably from where she sits in the Chancellor's office. That's posed some problems, but nothing insurmountable. I think she tended to use each position to reinforce the other, basically.

Don Heath, who's been president last year and this year has done an excellent job, I think. And partly, I think, credit must go to Harry [Gianneschi]. For many, many years, our alumni were a source of a lot of interference, but not much support. And I think we're turning that around to where they see their role more as not fighting the University, but actually supporting it. We welcome their input in any area. The "Alumni Action Day" this year—I think the first, I hope, in an annual series—was an important event. We did prepare a report for the Board of Regents for the last session on that, didn't have time to give it. We will give it probably the July meeting. They have a written report—we'd like to—I'd like to have 'em meet Harry [Gianneschi] for one thing. I'm not sure they really are aware of who he is and what he's done.

Anyway, I think probably I'm a little bit nervous now. That office looks, like it's gonna develop a little bit faster than I wanted it to. And at the same time, you have to sort of take advantage of the opportunities that do come along. It would be a mistake not to do something if you had a good opportunity, merely because it's a little bit faster—it's happening faster than you really want it to happen, you know. So, we'll watch it closely. But I think it's going to develop into a good resource for the total University. And we're moving, I think, for the first time, toward having a unified public relations program.

That's something the University sorely needs and yet it's one of the most difficult things to achieve, because you have to take something away from somebody in order to accomplish it. It'll take time to get there, but even though—right now I think it's coming even faster than I wanted it to happen.

The "Alumni Action Day" has a way of focusing alumni attention back on the University. Harry [Gianneschi] billed it as a spring answer to the "homecoming"—football homecoming—in the fall. It's an academic answer to football homecoming. And the response, this year, I thought was quite good. We had people that came from all over the—well, from New Jersey to Hawaii, here, to come back and be involved in their old department.

We've agreed to put on for a year a series of bi-weekly television shows which we are filming here at the University. We had our inaugural television show last Monday night—a week ago Monday night. We're supposed to follow either the baseball game or the movie, whichever, whether they have the baseball game early or late. It is a prime time spot though, ten-thirty every other Monday night. And I felt the first one of those came off extremely well. It is produced totally here on the campus by our people, and it had a professional quality, I think, that would compare with anything that's done at the stations here in town. And I guess they're screening it twice. They're screening it on the Monday night slot, and at least this first one also screened at least in one morning time slot. Apparently they're pleased with it.

I may be repeating myself. One of the problems we have in external relations, I think, are school relations. And that's one that we need to work on. And here again, I think, it's gonna involve some personnel—well, some assignment reallocation or

reassignment of duties. But we want to have fixed plans develop before we start just doing things for the sake of doing it. We allocated money this year to build a film to use in our recruitment program, and hopefully, that'll be finished—it takes about a year to finish, because we want to do the full cycle of a year's activities on the University campus. And mainly, it's a "teaser" type film. It's not designed to be informational, particularly. It's designed to capture the students' interest, first of all, and "come to the University of Nevada, Reno." And after we have their interest, we feel we can explain what we have to offer. But they're not gonna listen to what we have to offer 'til we first capture the interest to make 'em believe this is an exciting place to come to school.

How did that come about?

Oh, once again, Gianneschi played a large role. He and I were—I was complaining one day about, I thought our recruitment effort was not what it should be. And he had been involved in the school relations of Western Illinois University where he was before he came here and he had a copy of the recruitment film they used. We'd been using a little slide show. And he brought it up and he screened it for me, and it is so much better than we were doing, you know. It's just a big gulf between the two. So I got Harry and Dan Tone, Don Potter, Jack Shirley, Bob Gorrell, Roberta Barnes, and Shelba Gamble; basically people who I think have something to contribute judgement-wise, and we sat down and watched our slide show and Harry's film together. We reached the obvious conclusion we had a ways to go in developing our school relations program. We're not copying what WIU did, but I think that's—we also got some ideas—I have not screened those. We

also picked up some copies of recruitment films used by other schools. In any event, we decided this is a good place to invest ten, fifteen thousand dollars in developing one of our own. We got some interviews, for example, at the recent commencement from parents about why they were glad their kids chose UNR, you know. Hopefully, all that we interviewed were glad their children chose UNR!

And we shot footage of every—we began about two months ago, building this. We shot events of everything that's happened, Mackay Day—. And we were emphasizing the social side of the campus, no question about it. We'll have a lot of classroom, laboratory shots too, but where possible, we'll emphasize people all the way through. Our slide show was mostly buildings; very, very dull. And this is very much a people-oriented effort. And hopefully, we'll have it in the can ready to use, not really in time to help next year's school relations program, but the one—well, we should inaugurate it along in the spring sometime. And certainly, it'll be one of the mainstays of the program, then, the following years. And we'll make some other changes the following year, too, I think, to give it a whole new look all the way across the board, new people, new everything.

New mailing pieces. You know, Harry's about convinced me that the catalog is a miserable school relations mailer in the sense that, you know, we oughta have something other to send out to students. They oughta have catalogs available to them, and when they ask for a catalog they should certainly get it. But the initial mailer should be something other than the fall catalog. It'd have the advantage of saving some money probably, as well as—the catalog is pretty formidable, really. As something a high school senior or junior should sit down and try to look at and

figure out on his own, it'd be better to talk to some counselor and the counselor—it's important that the counselor, himself, also be skilled in the use of the catalog. So, I think we perhaps have not been directing our efforts right where they should go. The heavy stuff, we probably oughta deal more with the counselors, you know. Anyway, we are at least recognizing we have some work to do in that area and I think our enrollment figures probably enter into it as much, too. We're losing too many students and too many *good* students, to other schools, that should be coming here.

Did Harry work on the catalog this year?

He had some input. I think it's in part that Jack Shirley still controls it, but he recognizes that, "we ain't happy" with it, you know. And he's making some effort—he probably wouldn't admit this even—but he's making some effort to respond to what has become a general satisfaction, I think. The shots do emphasize people more, and that certainly was one of the complaints that came out of the review of the slide show, that it was too much building oriented, too stilted, too formal, a lot of things. We, in the slide show, spent time introducing each dean, and I'm not sure that a high school junior or senior has much interest in knowing who's dean of Agriculture, or Arts and Science, or any other college at the University at that point in time.

I had planned to build up the Gianneschi office with Alumni and Development over a period of time and I did plan this year to transfer the information office (Ed Olsen's office) over there. Several reasons: I think information fits well into that area, first of all. A more practical consideration is the fact that Ed's health is such that he needs

to be backstopped, augmented, covered for. Since I talked to Ed, there's been another development. Ed actually is thinking seriously about taking disability retirement, and that, I think, is not related to the decision to merge. I think he understood what that was all about. He can only be here about half the time. His emphysema has got to the point where he just doesn't have the stamina to work a full day.

I never have been pleased with the press coverage of the University. I think the handling of the newspaper last week on the Home Economics dean's stepping down is typical.

Anybody who really wanted to know about it didn't find out anything.

Didn't find out anything.

On improving, you know, we keep plugging away. I think the coverage has improved some, oh, in the last, say, year, year and a half. I think Pat O'Driscoll is a pretty good reporter and if he's left on the University beat, I think in another year or two he'll understand enough about the University to do a reasonably good job of covering it. If he's pulled off and assigned somewhere else and some other *Sagebrush* graduate goes down there, then I don't know; we're back where we were before.

How can you educate a reporter like that?

Whatever time I can afford, that I can spend with them, I do. Whenever they come out to talk to me about anything, and that's pretty regular, I don't have to go out of my way to get to talk to them. They're out here quite a bit. I always, wherever I can get 'em to let me talk off the record, I'll do some talking off the record. And it's by nature of background—background briefings.

After the Tripple thing* dies down, for example, I would use that to educate Pat some about how administrative changes are made. I would not do that now. I would not ask him to accept the background, or an off-the-record type briefing. I try to respect the reporter's responsibility as *he* perceives it, first of all.

I think we'll bring the press around eventually, at least a long way from where they are or where they have been. I think they've come around some already.

*Dismissal of Dean of Home Economics

CONCLUSION: JUNE, 1977

In general, I feel, I guess, by way of conclusion for this episode of it, I feel pretty good about the University of Nevada. I think it's got a lot of promise; it's got a lot of problems. I think we'll have to find ways to encourage more productivity on the part of our faculty. I think we've got to find some way of convincing students—prospective students—that we're as good as we are. We've gotta find some way in the next two years of getting a little bit better support, and it's not a helluva lot better really, but a little bit better support from the state than we're getting. We'll always be asking for a lot more than we'll get, and if we'd've received another million and a half dollars—another million dollars—each year of the biennium this year, we'd have been in pretty good shape. We couldn't have done all the things we wanted to do; we could have done the things we needed to do. And that's about five, six, seven—now, that's not counting any extra for faculty salaries. Faculty salaries—we oughta've gotten another three percent for additional faculty salaries. So a total of about a million-three the first year and

about a million-five the second year would have put us in good shape. That's the margin of under-funding that we're suffering through. We've got serious problems in the next two years, because we've got the Med school that's gonna be requiring some additional support, although I think that'll really hit us four years down the pike, rather than two years.

We have some building problems, but our space is generally not terribly inadequate. There are people that have some pretty poor offices around the campus that would argue with that point, but generally, based upon what I've seen across the country at other public universities, we're not in that bad a shape spacewise.

Anyhow, I guess, I still have some—I have no objection to gaming at all, but I still have a little bit of concern about the University functioning here in this particular social climate. I think there's something yet to be proved there and I think maybe it *can* be proved. I think in terms of a national recognition, I think this is a problem we have to deal with. I still get people saying, "My God,

they've got a university in Reno?" You know? As though that's the most unlikely thing in the world that that ever happened.

But I think the University has a lot of promise. You know, it's small enough that we can try things that would be almost impossible to try in California or Michigan or a place like that. And I think we shouldn't be terribly timid about trying.

I think, you know, we have our problem with our Board of Regents. That's one of our more *serious* problems at the present time, I think. I don't see any solution to that problem in the short run. It's one that we've got to overcome some way. I don't think we're gonna solve it, we've just got to overcome the problem. And I think that can be done, in part by letting people see the Regents more (and I've already started doing some things along that line). At least individually, they're not as bad as they behave in their meetings. In part an exposure to the Board, and in part, I think, convincing people that the University does a pretty good job *despite* what the Board does. I think we can work on both of those simultaneously. You know, I had people—I won't name the name here at all—but I had someone tell me, a legislator tell me, that the reason he didn't work harder for our budget was that he just couldn't turn money over to that Board of Regents.

And I said, "Hell, you don't turn money over to the Board of Regents!" You know, they approve our budget, but we developed the budget. You know, the question is whether you've got confidence in the University as an institution. The Board out there is a pretty peripheral concern when you come right down to it, as far as the University's total mission is concerned. The Board doesn't say put money into philosophy as opposed to English, or engineering as opposed to mathematics or anything like that. Those

are decisions you make administratively. And you know, I kept saying in front of the committees last time where certain individuals were criticizing the Board, I said, "Look, the problems—the complaints you're lodging here aren't at the Board—if there're complaints you oughta make it to *us*, because *I'm* the one that made the decision."

They never quite said it was a complaint. They just wanted to know, you know, they were fishing to see if there were grounds for complaints, and if they had 'em they oughta've made 'em to me and blame *me* for them and not the Board. The Board didn't change our work program an iota any one of the years I've been here. Not one iota. They approved it as submitted, and the priorities that were reflected in the work program were those that we worked out on this campus totally.

In some respects the University has a great deal of autonomy granted to it by the Board. It's just that the places where they refused to grant the autonomy are somehow the most annoying places, you know [laughing].

Well, shall we wrap it up for a year with that?

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Academic Council, 74, 115,
126-132
Admissions office, 93
Affirmative Action, 203,
204, 205
Agriculture, College of,
11
Alumni Association, 229,
230-232
Anderson, Elizabeth, 39,
159
Anderson, Fred M., 78,
158, 162-163, 164, 166,
171, 179-180
Anderson, James T., 25,
37-38, 39, 61, 84-85,
108, 159, 173
Arkansas, 1, 4-6, 10, 33-34,
195
Arts and Science, College
of, 70-79, 106, 107
Atkinson, Glen, 60
Ault, Christopher T., 203,
204

B

Baepler, Donald, 149, 150,
160
Baker, Arthur III, 108,
109-110, 111
Baldwin, Jean, 19, 26
Barmettler, Edmund R., 55
Barnes, Roberta, 103-105,
234
Barrett, Howard Gene, 182,
183, 187-188, 195, 197
Basta, Sam M., 15-16, 59,
173-174, 200-201

Beaulieu, Patrick L., 52,
53, 56-57
Big Sky Conference, 202
Bohmont, Dale W., 11, 89,
125
Brand, Vera, 88-89, 90-91
Breese, Charles R., 108, 109
Brotten, George A. "Art," 71
Buchanan, James L. "Bucky,"
158-159
Buchanan, John A., 162
Bumpers, Dale, 5, 33, 34
Burkhart, Richard D., 71
Burton, Marion, 6
Bushnell, Eleanore, 71
Business Administration,
College of, 69-70, 80-83,
105-108, 221-222

C

Cain, Edmund J., 25, 118,
119, 120
Cargill, Thomas F., 106
Central State University
(Oklahoma), 3, 11, 98
Chamber of Commerce, Reno,
48, 221
Community College division,
149-150, 151, 166
Community Relations office,
173-174
Cufflin, Cris, 170-171

D

Dankworth, Richard T., 11,
94-97, 126, 215, 216, 228
Davis, Fred A., 48
Dawson, Mark, 143

Desert Research Institute
(DRI), 143, 150, 151, 166
DeVoge, Susan, 194-195
Donehower, Grace, 95
Donnelly, Charles, 149
Driggs, Don W., 6, 7

E

Education, College of, 91,
113, 119-122
Engineering, College of, 108,
144-145
Engineering Council for Pro-
fessional Development (ECPD),
87-88
Extended Programs and Continu-
ing Education (EPCE), 96

F

Faculty Senate, 53, 54, 56-
57, 60-65, 67, 73, 163-170
Farnsworth, Clara, 20, 21, 22,
23, 24, 25, 26-28, 32, 35
Far West Conference, 201
Ferguson, Neal, 60
Fleischmann Atmospherium-
Planetarium, 227-228
Fong, Lilly, 156-157, 159-
160, 163, 168
Fuss, Betty, 28-29

G

Gamble, Shelba, 21, 27, 33-
36, 37, 43, 234
Garberson, John, 42
General University Extension
(GUE), 95, 96
Gianneschi, Harry, 42, 184-
185, 214, 215-216, 219-220,
228, 229, 231, 232, 233-
234, 235, 236
Gibson, James N., 193-194
Ginsburg, Gerald P., 53
Gorrell, Robert M., 36, 37,
38-39, 43, 47, 54, 61, 75,

Gorrell (cont.)

77, 86, 126, 128, 133, 160,
162, 168-170, 171, 234
Graduate Council, 73
Grotegut, Eugene, 43, 53, 56,
57, 60, 61, 62, 76, 77,
169

H

Haddawy, Hussain, 58
Halvorson, John, 42
Hattori, Henry, 101, 102,
103
Heard, Alex, 15, 17
Heath, Don, 231
Heidtman, Agnes, 23
Hilbrecht, Norman Ty, 180
Home Economics, School of,
114, 117-118, 237, 238
Hug, Procter R., Jr., 166
Hughs, Richard E., 69-70
107, 108, 222
Hulse, James W., 13
Humphrey, Neil D., 9, 78-79,
80, 98-99, 133-138, 140,
142-143, 144, 145, 146,
147-149, 150, 151, 160,
171-172, 178-179

I

Institutional Studies and
Budget office, 98-99

J

Jackson, Douglas J., 63-64
Jeffers, Robert D., 25
Jessup, K. Donald, 22, 97-
99, 103
Jones, Edgar, 207-209

K

Karamanos, Christ N., 158-
159, 162

Kinney, Robert G., 104
Kinsinger, Jack B., 74-75,
79
Knorr, Al, 146-147
Knudtsen, Molly F., 158,
163, 164, 166

L

Lauri, Nick, 230
Lemberes, Alexander, 71
Lerude, Warren, 218, 226
Lessly, Larry, 174
Library, 122-123
Lilly, Luella, 206-207
Little Rock, Arkansas, 7
Lombardi, Louis, 78, 159,
162-163, 164
Loshbaugh, Lorna, 20, 23,
29-30

Mc

McCormick, James, 42
McDermitt, Johnny, 204
McHenry report (1957), 14
McKee, Robert B., 71
McQueen, Robert, 78-79

M

Mackay School of Mines, 108,
109-111 144-145
Marschall, John, 53
Martinez, Delia, 169, 230-
231
Mason, Brenda, 162
Mayer, Tom, 172-173, 174
Medical Sciences, School of,
124, 125-126
Milam, Marilyn, 1-2, 8, 9,
25, 39, 52, 198
Miller, N. Edd, 172, 174
Morehouse, Harold G., 122-123
Morgan, Shirley, 104-105
Morrill Hall, 228-230

N

National College of the
State Judiciary, 49
National Collegiate Athletic
Association, 199, 207,
208-209
National Society of Profes-
sors (NSP), 14, 53, 57,
60, 63, 64, 70, 72
Nellor, John E., 71
Nursing, School of, 88-89,
91-92

O

O'Brien, Thomas D., 7, 113-
114
O'Callaghan, Donal N. "Mike,"
182, 183-184, 185-193, 197,
222-223
O'Driscoll, Pat, 237-238
Office of Civil Rights (OCR),
U.S., 169
Ogilvie, Ron, 99
Oklahoma, 2, 199-200
Oklahoma Baptist University
(Shawnee), 2, 18
Oklahoma State University,
171, 198-200
Oliver, Clela, 29, 214
Oliver, Earl, 29
Olsen, Edward A., 218-219,
220, 236-237

P

Pine, Edward L., 32-33, 47,
100-101, 104, 126
Pinkerton, Joel, 182
Plath, Neil, 221
Porta, Mena, 20, 24, 25-26
Potter, Donald D., 42, 234

R

Rabedeaux, Clayt, 214
Regents, Board of, 8-9, 77,
78-79, 134, 153, 154-174,
179, 240-242
Registrar, 93-94
Richardson, James T., 52, 53,
56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61,
160, 169-170, 180-181, 205
Rockefeller, Winthrop, 3, 4-
5, 10
Ross, John Tom, 78, 158-159,
162
Rottman, Dick L., 107
Rural Development Act of
1973, U.S., 10
Rusco, Elmer, 205
Rushing, Corbitt, 18
Ryall, Alan, 56, 57-58

S

Sagebrush, 217, 237
S Bar S ranch, 157
Scales, James Ralph, 16-18
Scattini, Jerrold P., 201-
204, 226
Scully, Thomas J., 124, 125
Shirley, Jack, 42, 93, 94,
97, 103, 234, 236
Sigma Delta Chi, 218
Smith, Catherine, 59, 206
Smith, George T., 123-124,
125-126
Stafford, Rebecca S., 72,
75, 76-77, 78, 108, 134
Student Affairs Board, 66

T

Test, Peter A., 102
Thompson, Helen R., 158, 160,
168, 169
Tompson, Robert N., 71
Tone, Daniel J., 42, 234
Tripple, Patricia, 114-115,
116, 117-118, 238

Tucker, Thomas T., 114, 118

U

University of Arkansas, 3-4,
6, 68
University of Kentucky, 3
University of Nevada-Las
Vegas (UNLV), 145, 146,
151, 166
University of Oklahoma, 2-3

V

Vanderbilt University, 15

W

Wake Forest University, 16,
18
Warren, Wallace D. "Wallie,"
164
Weems, Robert C., 81, 105,
106, 222
Whalen, Brian, 100
Wolf, Harry, 29, 205
Wolf Pack Boosters, 214,
224-226